



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2005

No. 94

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 13, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Arnold B. Lovell, Senior Pastor, Second Presbyterian Church, Knoxville, TN, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save; throughout the centuries You have guided the hands, hearts, and lives of the founders, leaders, and citizens of this Nation. We invoke Your presence and power today for those upon whom the mantle of leadership has fallen. As the Members of Congress gather this day, give them courage, clarity of vision, and compassionate hearts, that in their frailty as human beings they might carry out the enormous task of service to which they have been called.

May the decisions made in the deliberations of this day be governed by the common good, virtue, and the principles of participation, affirming the equality that all men and women have before You, O God. Give our representatives strength and honesty to avoid the politics of personal agendas, power, and partisanship, that they might serve the public good. And may all glory be given unto You, Almighty God. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EDWARDS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING THE REVEREND DR. ARNOLD B. LOVELL

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, our guest chaplain today is my friend, Dr. Arnold Lovell, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Knoxville.

The Second Presbyterian is one of Knoxville's leading churches with approximately 1,000 members. Arnold has led that church as a senior pastor since 1997. Prior to that, he served for 10 years on the faculty of Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, VA, as a professor of evangelism. He still teaches there in summer programs.

Before that he was pastor of the first Presbyterian Church in South Charleston, WV. Dr. Lovell has two doctorates and is a leader in denominational activities of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Before going into the ministry, he was a coach of football and other sports at West Davidson High School in

North Carolina. He is a chaplain for the Knoxville Quarterback Club and an avid fan of NASCAR and U.T. football.

He and his wife Emily have two daughters, Carolyn and Catherine, and the Lovell women are here today in the gallery.

Arnold Lovell is a patriotic American, a leader in both Tennessee and the Nation, and I am fortunate to have him as a friend and as guest chaplain in the United States House of Representatives today.

### THE RETURN OF "DISCOVERY"

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago on a Saturday morning, the vessel and crew of space shuttle mission STS-107 were lost in the high skies over Texas.

That same day, even in mourning, America made a promise to the memory of the Columbia Seven that our journey in space will continue, that their legacy of discovery would survive them.

This afternoon at 3:51 on the east coast, the space shuttle *Discovery*, carrying as it will two women, five men, and the ancient hopes of an entire planet, will keep that promise by rocketing out of our atmosphere and into history.

Commander Eileen Collins and her crew, James Kelly, Andrew Thomas, Wendy Lawrence, Charles Camarda, Stephen Robinson, and Soichi Noguchi will pilot the safest, most sophisticated, and reliable spacecraft ever built back into low earth orbit to begin NASA's historic work realizing President Bush's bold new vision for space exploration.

That mission will command the physical and intellectual energies of some of America's brightest and bravest for years to come. The men and women of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5743

NASA, some of my constituents and some of my heroes, who devote their lives to doing the impossible for our Nation and our world, will spend the next decade and more on a technological and visionary quest: To send and resend the shuttle fleet into space to complete the International Space Station; to examine with unprecedented vigor and precision in the galaxy's preeminent laboratory the long-term exposure of the human body to microgravity and radiation; to design and construct the next generation of American spacecraft; to return to the moon; and to plot and endeavor a manned mission to Mars.

The exploration of the unknown is one of the innate motivating forces of our species. That universal and ancient yearning will be satisfied today by NASA's heroic "corps of discovery" in a mission not to conquer space, but to conquer human ignorance.

The darkness will be lighted, and this afternoon seven heroes will carry the torch of human discovery into the void.

Our future in space is still unknown and unknowable: The station remains incomplete, the moon is still years away, and Mars is still a red speck in the night sky, but today's launch is a step toward our destiny.

And like all steps into the unknown, the voyage of *Discovery*, T-minus 5 hours and 40 minutes, will prove the next giant leap in "the most hazardous and dangerous and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked."

#### VETERAN FUNDING SHORTFALL

(Mr. SALAZAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran, I have made a pledge to serve my country, and because of my desire to defend the ideals of democracy that I still cherish.

As part of our commitment, the Army promised all veterans a variety of benefits. In the past several years, I have seen some of those promises turn from honored commitments to veterans and their families to empty words that seem to be worth nothing more than the paper they are written on.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, we were informed the Veterans Administration would fall short by more than a billion dollars of what is needed to provide critical services to veterans. I was angered and dismayed at this gross negligence and oversight and spoke before this very House in strong support of the emergency spending bill passed 2 weeks ago.

We will soon be seeing another request from the President to complete the needed funding for the health care of our Nation's veterans. I will support this measure too because I support our veterans, but it is absurd and it is a crying shame that the health of veterans boils down to bitter partisan fights.

As Democrats, we have repeatedly demanded full funding for our veterans' needs. It is our duty to fully fund the Veterans Administration and do it right the first time, not after three or four attempts.

#### WELCOMING ELIZABETH ALEXANDER

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, birth is a happy event for all peoples. We rejoice because we hope that child will make the world better. Every time a child is born, the Good Lord is making a bet on the future of mankind. We do not pick our parents, and we do not get to pick the country of our birth. And we who are born in the U.S.A. are the most fortunate of all people in the history of the world.

Last night in Waco, Texas, about the time the sun was going down, 8:29 p.m., Elizabeth Lenna Alexander was born, 7 pounds 3 ounces, July 12, 2005. The world she has been born into is full of the good and the not so good.

Our country must always be willing to protect the greatest resource, the innocent of our country, the soul of our future, our children.

It is my hope that her parents, Kara and Shane Alexander, will raise Elizabeth with a sense of justice and compassion, community, courage, and a deep sense and concern for liberty.

So Elizabeth, as your grandfather, I welcome you to the U.S.A. Make it a better place, a place of more freedom.

#### URGING CANDOR ON IRAQ

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, you cannot solve a problem if you do not acknowledge that you have a problem. In that light, I appreciate and applaud the comments of outgoing Under Secretary of Defense Doug Feith made to the Washington Post concerning the costly mistakes made in Iraq.

During a recent interview, Mr. Feith said, "It is an extremely complex judgment to know whether the course that we chose with its pros and cons was more sensible."

Further, he noted the transfer of power to Iraqis did not happen fast enough and that we were not able to train the Iraqis.

Mr. Feith's comments stand in contrast to the President's inability and unwillingness to acknowledge any errors made in the Iraq war effort.

The administration did a great job planning for a quick victory on the battlefield and for occupation, yet things have not turned out as planned. Some of today's challenges are a direct result of those mistakes made by the administration.

After 1,800 American lives, more than 10,000 wounded American GIs and \$340 billion with no end in sight, now is the time to level with the American people. If we are going to be successful, we must work together, and to work together, you must be frank and honest.

Mr. Feith, thank you for your recent candor. Mr. President, we can do it. We are here to help, but it starts with truth and candor.

#### UTILIZING THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, how do you haul corn, soybeans, fertilizer, petroleum products, coal and rock from Chicago, Illinois, to the port of New Orleans, or from the port of New Orleans up to Chicago, Illinois, without taking 870 tractor-trailer trucks over our highway system? That is 870 trucks that burn diesel fuel, 870 trucks that clog our interstate highway system, 870 trucks that made some of our roads less safe.

Mr. Speaker, you do it by the river, by the Mississippi River system. That is one of the best ways in which we can be an environmental steward, by getting all of these trucks off the road. That is one of the best ways that we can unclog our highway and transportation system. That is one of the best ways that we get a better return on investments and lower price fuels is by doing that.

The Water Resources Development Act, which we will take up on the floor this afternoon and tomorrow, is the best way to be a good environmental steward, energy security, and promote the well-being of all Americans. I ask Members support for passage.

#### VALERIE PLAME'S IDENTITY

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, when news broke early this week that Karl Rove was involved in the outing of CIA agent Valerie Plame, it was clear that either Karl Rove had been withholding his involvement from the White House, or that the White House knew of his involvement and falsely allowed the public to believe he had no role in the scandal.

This Congress should be outraged by Mr. Rove's involvement and should be demanding answers from both him and the White House. I would like to know when exactly, if ever, President Bush was told of Mr. Rove's involvement. If the President did indeed know, that means that the White House is involved in a coverup which should be investigated by this House.

Mr. Rove's actions are a major abuse of power. Valerie Plame was a covert

CIA agent stationed in many hot spots around the world. When someone in the White House decided to leak her name to reporters, they were not only jeopardizing Plame's life, but also the lives of other covert agents she has been in contact with.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans should be concerned about whether or not this White House has been spreading this information. The only way we can get answers is by conducting a congressional investigation. It is time that this Congress do its job.

#### SPACE SHUTTLE LAUNCH

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, the Nation mourned the space shuttle *Columbia* tragedy. President Bush declared, "This cause of exploration and discovery is not an option we choose, it is a desire written in the human heart."

Today, seven more astronauts will take hold of that desire and follow their heart into space. This return to flight marks a new era of space travel with unparalleled safety measures. As the crew tests new safety techniques and delivers much-needed supplies to the International Space Station, we will all watch. We will watch with excitement and pride, and we will remember. We will remember and honor the lost crew of the space shuttle *Columbia*.

The *Columbia* crewmembers valiantly gave their lives pursuing knowledge in our name for space exploration and today, we continue our quest to get our shuttle program back.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to those who worked so hard to get that shuttle program back. To today's crewmembers, Eileen Collins, James Kelly, Charles Camarda, Wendy Lawrence, Soichi Noguchi, Steve Robinson, and Andy Thomas, may they be safe and may their mission be successful. We thank them for their dedication, their determination, and their courage. Godspeed.

□ 1015

#### SOCIAL SECURITY PRIVATIZATION

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, early this year the President said, "There's no Social Security trust." Lately, some White House supporters in this Congress say they want to establish private accounts with money from the same trust fund which the President says does not exist. That way, when favored Wall Street interests take the money from the administration's private accounts and lose it in stock speculation, they can turn around and tell the American people, "Hey, the money was never there to begin with."

There is a line in the Bible which says, "That which is crooked cannot be made straight." Think about that line when you think about Social Security privatization.

#### AMERICA'S FLOURISHING ECONOMY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Fridays are turning out to be a great day for American workers for more than one reason. Last Friday, the Department of Labor announced that over 146,000 new jobs were created for American workers in June. Over the last 25 consecutive months, 3.7 million Americans have gone to work due to President Bush's tax cuts. Additionally, the national unemployment rate has dropped over the past year to 5 percent, which represents the fastest decline in nearly a decade. More Americans are working now than ever before in our Nation's history and our tax receipts continue to rise as the Federal deficit continues to steadily decline. The Congressional Budget Office now predicts that our deficit may fall to under \$325 billion. Friday's job reports continue to bring positive news for American families and prove that President Bush's tax cuts are moving the economy forward.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11.

#### VETERANS HEALTH CARE FUNDING

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 13 days since the House could have passed a \$1.5 billion emergency VA health care spending bill to address the VA health care crisis in America. Unfortunately for millions of America's veterans, the House leadership refused to pass the bipartisan bill that the Senate had already passed by a vote of 96-0. We could have already had help on the way, but the House leadership said no.

Yesterday, the VA confirmed what House Democrats said on this floor 13 days ago, the House leadership-backed VA bill does not fully address the VA health care crisis. Every day that goes by is a day when veterans are either having their important health care delayed or canceled. The House Republican leadership caused this VA health care crisis by underfunding VA health care for 2 years. Now they have a responsibility to deal with it.

Now I hear the House leadership says we might be on vacation this Friday. What is more important, Members of the House taking a vacation this Friday or addressing the needs of America's veterans?

#### VETERANS HEALTH CARE FUNDING

(Mr. BUYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would say that my good friend from Texas's 1-minute is very unfortunate because, CHET, you and I are working together. We are working with your colleague, Chairman WALSH, to find the right number. And so to try to say that, gee, there is a bogeyman, there is a bad person here, that is false. What we are looking for, CHET, is to get the right number.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would advise Members that they should address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members either in the second person or by given name.

Mr. BUYER. I can address the Chair, but I think we know who we are talking to.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman who just spoke will be very careful, because we are trying to work together to get the right number. I think it is an embarrassing moment. When we ask the administration for the number, they testify to a number, and then we find that it is not right potentially? We are trying to get the number right and to make sure that veterans are served properly on a bipartisan basis. Please, let us not erode that.

#### VA FUNDING SHORTFALL

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the administration told Congress that the VA health care system did not need any more money. Then, feeling the heat, they said they needed an additional \$975 million. Just yesterday, the Bush administration conceded that it had made another mistake. Now they say they need another \$300 million. It is clear that either the administration cannot get it right or does not want to get it right. The nearly \$1.3 billion that the administration now admits is necessary this year is the amount Democrats have been working hard for this last year. The Republican leadership has consistently fought adequate increases in the VA health care budget. Now, more than 50,000 veterans are coming to health care appointments and being denied care. It is time to stop nickel-and-diming veterans health care and give the veterans of this country what they need and deserve.

#### POSITIVE ECONOMIC NEWS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is great economic news for American workers. The reason this economy is growing is because of small business. That is why we are celebrating Small Business Week. We found out from the Bureau of Labor Statistics last week, 25 months of consecutive economic growth, 146,000 jobs in June. We have unemployment at near historic lows. We are going to see the deficit \$100 billion less than projected. The reason that is happening, the reason we have steady economic growth, is because the tax reductions are working. The tax reductions are working, and we are seeing higher Federal revenues.

We are going to continue with this. It shows that the agenda laid forth by the majority leadership has worked for all Americans, and we are going to continue to work to reduce Federal regulations like the bills we did in dealing with OSHA to make the environment more friendly for small business to do what they do best, create those jobs. We look forward to continuing to create the environment for a great competitive American workplace.

#### WHITE HOUSE STONEWALLING ON ROVE

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 2 days since we discovered Karl Rove told a Time magazine reporter that Ambassador Joe Wilson's wife was a CIA agent, and what is the response from the White House? Silence.

White House press secretary Scott McClellan has refused to take questions from reporters for the last 2 days on Karl Rove, citing an ongoing Federal investigation. However, McClellan had no trouble spreading erroneous information about Rove's supposed innocence.

On October 1, 2003, McClellan was asked about Rove's involvement; and after first stating that there was an ongoing investigation taking place, McClellan continued by stating, "It's simply not true that he was involved in leaking classified information."

Nine days later in reference to another question about Rove, McClellan began by reminding reporters of an ongoing investigation, but then continued by stating that Rove had assured him he was not involved.

It now turns out that everything the White House was saying was false. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing investigation is not what is keeping the Bush White House from commenting. They are stonewalling because they cannot explain these falsehoods away. It is time for the stonewalling to end.

#### THE ECONOMY

(Mr. CHOCOLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHOCOLA. As we have heard, Mr. Speaker, last week our country did receive more good economic news. The jobless rate fell to 5 percent in June, the lowest rate since September of 2001. Economic growth has continued to average a strong and steady 4 percent. The deficit is down by over \$100 billion to its lowest point in 3 years. And tax receipts have skyrocketed this year.

That news should send a clear signal to Members of this body, it is time to give the tax cuts of 2003 the credit that they deserve. Time and again we have learned that the best way to achieve growth and create jobs is for hard-working people to keep more of their own money in their own pockets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help sustain this growth and help eliminate the deficit by controlling spending and making the 2003 tax cuts permanent.

#### VA BUDGET SHORTFALL

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again the administration is forced to admit that it failed to acknowledge the full extent of the VA's budget shortfall. In June, the administration submitted a request for \$975 million to keep the VA ship afloat. This number was a joke. Democrats, myself included, protested that at least \$1.3 billion would be required to meet the VA's obligation to our Nation's veterans.

Former VA Secretary Anthony Principi, then Chairman Chris Smith and Ranking Member EVANS, the Independent Budget, the American Legion, and countless veterans wrote Members of Congress and warned us that the VA could not operate with the budget request submitted by the administration. As usual, the administration stubbornly clung to its ridiculously low figure. Once again, the administration was wrong.

Now that the administration acknowledges its billion-dollar shortfall, let us make sure our veterans are provided for and that no veteran in this country goes without the best health care we can provide to these great Americans.

#### NEED TO MONITOR FEMA

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my condolences to Floridians in the wake of Hurricane Dennis. Hurricane Dennis blasted into Florida as a category 3 storm and is estimated to have caused about \$1 billion worth of damage and the loss of seven lives. I share my fellow Floridians' anguish over their losses. This hurricane unfortunately is just the first of many that will assail Florida's coasts.

Last year, FEMA bungled cleanup efforts in the aftermath of four terrifying hurricanes by refusing to pay for debris removal on private roads, slow reimbursement, and exorbitant overpayments in the Miami-Dade area.

I urge FEMA to respond quickly to this latest hurricane so that the 2004 debacle is not repeated.

#### ROVE NEEDS TO BE STRAIGHTFORWARD ABOUT HIS INVOLVEMENT IN VALERIE PLAME SCANDAL

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Karl Rove needs to stop hiding behind his attorney and be straightforward with the American people about his involvement in the Valerie Plame scandal. Whether or not Karl Rove is the only administration official who leaked information to reporters remains to be seen. What is clear today is that Karl Rove has not been up-front with the American people. He has consistently denied any involvement in the case despite the revelation on Monday through his attorney that he did indeed tell a Time magazine reporter that Joseph Wilson's wife was a CIA agent. This is a serious breach of trust on Karl Rove's part. Truth and trust are devalued when this happens.

Larry Johnson, a former CIA operative who worked with Plame, explained how serious Rove's actions were, and I am quoting: "The fact that she's been undercover for 3 decades and has been divulged is outrageous because she was put undercover for certain reasons. One, she works in an area where people she meets with overseas could be compromised."

He needs to step down.

#### LONDON BOMBING

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my deepest condolences to our friends in London who suffered a heinous attack of terrorism last week when several bombs tore through their public transit system. Events like the London bombing remind us how absolutely important it is to stand firm against terrorism wherever it rears its hideous head. We must never let down our guard.

Next week, the House is slated to take up legislation to reauthorize 16 provisions in the PATRIOT Act. Those in Congress acted quickly in the wake of September 11 to get this strong legislation passed to help safeguard our Nation from the agony of another terrorist attack.

So far, we have been successful. The PATRIOT Act has helped our intelligence and law enforcement officials

prevent another attack from occurring on American soil. But last week's London bombings remind us that we are still in the middle of a fierce battle. Our safety depends on our intelligence and law enforcement officials having the tools they need to track terrorists and to prevent terrorism, at home and abroad. Indeed, this is not the time to let down our guard.

□ 1030

#### SUPPORT THE FLAKE-BLUMENAUER AMENDMENT TO ENSURE THAT THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER LOCK AND DAM EXPANSION IS JUSTIFIED

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we heard earlier today that there is a need to have a massive investment in the lock system in the Mississippi River to avoid having product move up and down in trucks. That is not the issue.

The problem that we are facing now is that more and more of the grain and other agricultural product are being shipped by truck and rail because it needs to get to locations not served by the Mississippi River system. This has been shown by the Congressional Research Service and the National Academy of Science.

The bill that is coming before us for a vote next week would be the Nation's most expensive waterway project and would siphon off 10 to 15 percent of all core construction funding for years, perhaps decades, to come, for an area where the barge traffic is actually going down.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the amendment that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and I are offering that would allow the project to go forward only if the minimum standards that make it economically viable are, in fact, met over the next 3 years.

#### TAXES AND BUDGET

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, since President Bush took office in January 2001, America has seen a recession that began before the administration was really up and running, the worst terror attacks in the history of the world, scandals that rocked the Fortune 500 companies and our financial markets, a war in Afghanistan, a war in Iraq, and the highest energy prices in recent memory.

We have faced enormous economic challenges that should have devastated the United States; but, instead, we have seen 4 years of economic growth, the best housing market in American history, all more evidence that tax re-

lief benefits the economy. And getting the government off the backs of the taxpayers actually helps our economic engine.

The 2001 tax cuts and the 2003 cuts on capital gains and dividends have been the linchpin to our economic rebound. Federal tax receipts are up this year. State tax receipts are up this year. The economy is turning around, and we have reduced the deficit by \$100 billion this year alone, all the work of tax relief and tight budgets, what we as Republicans believe, what we are fighting for, and they work.

#### TRUTH, TRUST, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, truth, trust, and accountability should be the defining characteristics of the American Presidency.

President Bush's press secretary, in October of 2003, Scott McClellan, told the White House press corps and, through them, the world at large that Karl Rove and two other high-level administration officials had assured him that they were not involved in outing CIA covert agent Valeria Plame. He said that unequivocally.

Now we find that Karl Rove has sat back in timid silence while he has watched two reporters go through the costly, torturous experience of legal prosecution, all to protect his identity.

Mr. Speaker, the 41st President of the United States, George Bush, for whom the CIA headquarters is named, said that what Karl Rove did was an act of treason. Mr. Speaker, it is time to hear from the President of the United States.

#### STOPPING THE SPREAD OF TERROR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the pledge made by Prime Minister Tony Blair. He said that we must "defeat terror and emerge from this horror with our values, our way of life, our tolerance and respect for others undiminished." I support that pledge.

The attacks on London show that the war on terror is not over, nor is it confined to a specific geographical domain. Securing our homeland is only one facet of the war. Spreading democracy in the savage lands where terrorism is allowed to propagate is another.

In the face of terrorism, a united front is one of the strongest weapons. A terrorist network that believes a nation so tested will fold under pressure of a few horrific acts may capture its attention, but will not achieve its submission. The terrorists who attacked Great Britain have underestimated the

resolve of an alliance that shares the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Those of us who thought the threat of terrorism receded with time now look no further than the horror visited on our closest allies. Complacency only allows the waves of terror crashing over the Western World to cause erosion. None of us in either country should be content to live under this constant threat. We must instead insure ourselves against such terror by allowing democracy to spread and flourish.

#### VETERANS HEALTH CARE

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, talk is cheap, but health care is very expensive; and for the last 5 years, the Bush administration has offered our veterans empty rhetoric while denying them access to needed health care.

As veterans groups and Democrats fought to increase the veterans budget for the last 3 years, the Republican majority and the White House have been in deep denial. But I get weekly reports, and I bet you do too, from my veterans rep who tells me that people's treatment has been delayed, denied, people who cannot even get in the door for 6 months.

Now, 2 weeks ago, the administration admitted, well, I guess we need another \$1 billion for health care for veterans this year. Today they said it is \$3 billion more; but they say, oh, you know, we just could not have known, we could not have anticipated there would be veterans coming home from Iraq or Afghanistan who are wounded and injured and need services. They did not know there was a war going on. And they also said they could not anticipate the aging of the World War II and Korean veterans. They did not build that into the budget. They just did not know.

But they had a chairman on that side for a couple of years who told us he did know. He told us we needed more money, and they fired him from that job. At least a few Republicans are standing up for what is right.

#### TIME FOR KARL ROVE TO COME CLEAN

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I guess the Republican leadership is now condoning Karl Rove's behavior, but think about what the previous President Bush said about this.

On September 30, 2003, and I am quoting President Bush, this is the current President Bush, "If there is a leak out of my administration, I want to know who it is, and if the person violated the law, the person will be taken care of."

Well, that was nice talk then, but now it appears that it was all talk. The

Republican leadership has no problem condoning Karl Rove's behavior and his leak. On Monday we learned that Karl Rove leaked Valeria Plame's identity, an act that Bush's father called treasonous.

Rove's actions were an outrageous abuse of power, but the longer President Bush allows him to remain on the job, the more it looks like the President is condoning activity that his own father called treasonous. It is amazing to me that the Republican leadership is now willing to come to the floor and say that that is okay. It is outrageous.

Listen to what the previous President Bush said: "Don't let this stone-wall continue on the part of the White House."

It is time that Karl Rove come clean. It is time that the President force him to resign.

#### ECONOMY AND JOBS

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, thanks to President Bush's economic growth plan passed by Republicans in Congress, I am very pleased to relay even more good news about America's expanding economy, growing jobs gains, and shrinking Federal deficit.

First, our economy grew at 3.8 percent in the first quarter. This is the 14th consecutive quarter of growth and one of the strongest growth performances in years. Secondly, a recent Congressional Budget Office report shows yet another decline in the Federal deficit due to this economic growth. The deficit is down about \$100 billion. More good news. The unemployment rate has now declined to 5 percent, the lowest level since that tragic day on 9/11.

Over the last 2 years, more than 3.7 million new jobs for the future have been created in America. These encouraging reports show once again that the tax relief for families and small businesses which President Bush and the Republican Congress passed is paying dividends: more jobs, higher incomes, and a lower deficit.

#### THE BUSH LEGACY: LARGEST NATIONAL DEBT IN HISTORY

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today the administration is telling us that the Federal budget deficit for this year will not be as large as they were predicting it would be back in January. Some are taking this as evidence of some type of supply-side miracle, but nothing could be further from the truth.

As analysts at Goldman Sachs have pointed out today, this year's large increase in tax receipts stems from temporary factors that are unlikely to be repeated, and some short-term im-

provement does not change the big picture.

The Bush administration has given us a record: the largest national debt in history, over \$7 trillion; and they have raised the ceiling, the debt ceiling three times. This breaks down to each citizen's share being over \$26,000. And they still have a record trade deficit, another record: the largest in history.

The administration may have another excuse to ignore the long-term structural budget problems of this Nation, but the American people deserve to know the truth: \$7 trillion, a debt that our children will have to pay.

#### TIME FOR THE WHITE HOUSE TO CLEAN UP ITS HOUSE

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, raising questions about national security is not partisanship; it is patriotism.

Now that we know that Karl Rove, the Deputy Chief of Staff at the White House outed a CIA agent, Republicans have begun to try to forgive the unforgivable, to explain the unexplainable. And to suggest that Karl Rove was simply trying to set a news story straight as a reason for outing a CIA agent is unacceptable.

CIA agents operate in secret so they can protect America from its enemies, from terrorism here at home. When their identity is revealed, not only are they put at risk, but America is also put at risk.

Whether Karl Rove violated the law or not is a question for the special prosecutor; but the White House said they had a higher standard, and it is the standard that should be enforced with Mr. Rove.

Former CIA agents have said that if this is not treacherous, it might very well be treasonous. Either way, it is time for the White House to clean up its house.

#### FUNDING FOR VETERANS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the cornerstone at the Department of Veterans Affairs from the time of Abraham Lincoln has read: "To care for them who shall have borne the battle, their widows, and their orphans." Why can this administration not keep that promise?

Veterans who have served our country and are now coming home, and the World War II, Korean, Vietnam and Persian Gulf War vets who are aging, are lined up, over 50,000 currently waiting to get into the system. Our doctors and nurses are stressed out.

We know we need \$1 billion additional funds for veterans health care. We seem to be able to find money for everything else in the world, but the

administration cannot get it right, or does not want to get it right on veterans care. A couple of weeks ago they said they did not need any more money. Then, yesterday, they said, oh, wait, maybe we need \$300 million, when their own chairman that they took off the committee 2 years ago, robbing him of his distinguished career here in public service to veterans, told us we needed \$1 billion, and they ripped him off the committee.

That is really wrong. It is not meeting our commitments to those on whom our freedom rests. And do my colleagues know what? It is having a major impact on our ability to recruit in our Guard, Reserve and Army, because they do not believe that this country will keep the promise that we have had enshrined since Lincoln . . . to care for those who have borne the battle.

□ 1045

#### VETERANS HEALTH CARE SHORTFALL

(Ms. HERSETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern shared by many of my colleagues this morning regarding the veterans affairs health care budget shortfall.

I am afraid this shortfall is further evidence that the misgivings many Members of Congress, veterans, and veterans service organizations have had about the VA health care budget have been justified.

The bottom line, in recent years veterans health care has not been given sufficient consideration when it comes time to write the budget. Providing the benefits earned by veterans, yesterday's heroes and today's, is part of the Federal Government's responsibility to provide for the common defense, a responsibility that should direct our funding priorities.

The necessity to reprogram \$1.27 billion to the medical services account for fiscal year 2005 and possibly up to \$1.7 billion, not factoring in \$600 million for enrollment fees and increased co-payments that will not be accepted by Congress, over the President's request for fiscal year 2006 is an obvious signal that VA health care is not suitably funded to meet the needs of our veterans.

However, this is not the first indication that the problem existed. It is not a problem that has crept into the system in the last few months. It is a problem that has existed for many years. I am pleased that we are now working to solve the shortfalls of fiscal year 2005 and 2006 and to ensure effective methodologies that can produce reliable projections regarding adequate levels of funding in the future.

#### HONOR OUR TROOPS

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the President asked this Nation to fly the flag for our troops over the Fourth of July holiday. But while the Nation supports the active duty men and women in uniform serving in harm's way, the President is shortchanging the soldiers who are now serving and will be veterans in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the appropriations subcommittee most ably led by the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), who has led the battle of pointing out the underfunding of the Veterans Administration for health care. We now see it is a fact.

Both the Republican leadership in the House and the Senate made a quick fix. The Democrats have said this fix is not enough, claiming that we will have a greater shortfall as the veteran soldiers from Iraq come home.

If you truly want to honor those serving, you have to pledge to honor them in the future. Fully funding veterans health care is the most patriotic way we can honor our troops, all of whom will some day be veterans.

#### SUPPORT OUR TROOPS—GIVE VETERANS BETTER HEALTH CARE

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, this morning in "CQ Today" we see: "Shortfall in Veterans Funds Widened."

The chairman of our committee says, well, we have to find the right number somewhere; we have to find the right number.

Well, I tell you, we had a process where we had the right number. The veterans service organizations through this Independent Budget said exactly what was needed and what we should have both for this year and for the coming year. But did we listen to them? No.

The Democrats on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Democrats on this floor tried to amend the appropriations bills so we would get the money that veterans need. They were voted down by a strict party-line vote: all the Democrats voting for the veterans, all the Republicans voting against.

We are at war, Mr. Speaker. The way that we win a war is to make sure that the troops when they come home have sufficient funding for health care. I have a thousand veterans on the waiting list at my veterans hospital in San Diego. The brave young men and women who are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan will have a high probability of having post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD.

Will they get the treatment they need? No. Will they have to wait a year for a dental appointment? Yes.

Let us support our troops by supporting them when they come home with proper VA health care funding.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which a vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

#### VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1220) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2005, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1220

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2005".*

##### SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) **RATE ADJUSTMENT.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, effective on December 1, 2005, increase the dollar amounts in effect for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation by the Secretary, as specified in subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.**—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) **COMPENSATION.**—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) **ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.**—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) **CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.**—The dollar amount in effect under section 1162 of such title.

(4) **NEW DIC RATES.**—The dollar amounts in effect under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1311(a) of such title.

(5) **OLD DIC RATES.**—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1311(a)(3) of such title.

(6) **ADDITIONAL DIC FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES WITH MINOR CHILDREN.**—The dollar amounts in effect under section 1311(b) of such title and paragraph (1) of section 1311(f) of such title (as redesignated by subsection (e) of this section).

(7) **ADDITIONAL DIC FOR DISABILITY.**—The dollar amounts in effect under sections 1311(c) and 1311(d) of such title.

(8) **DIC FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN.**—The dollar amounts in effect under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.**—

(1) **BASE FOR INCREASE.**—The increase under subsection (a) shall be made in the dollar amounts specified in subsection (b) as in effect on November 30, 2005.

(2) **PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), each such amount shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42

U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2005, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(3) **ROUNDING.**—Each dollar amount increased pursuant to paragraph (2) shall, if not a whole dollar amount, be rounded down to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) **SPECIAL RULE.**—The Secretary may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) **DESIGNATION CORRECTION.**—Section 1311 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating the second subsection (e) (added by section 301(a) of the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–454; 118 Stat. 3610)) as subsection (f).

##### SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

At the same time as the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2006, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b) of section 2, as increased pursuant to that section.

##### SEC. 4. CODIFICATION OF FISCAL YEAR 2005 COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT PROVIDED IN PUBLIC LAW 108–363.

(a) **VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION.**—Section 1114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "\$106" and inserting "\$108";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "\$205" and inserting "\$210";

(3) in subsection (c), by striking "\$316" and inserting "\$324";

(4) in subsection (d), by striking "\$454" and inserting "\$466";

(5) in subsection (e), by striking "\$646" and inserting "\$663";

(6) in subsection (f), by striking "\$817" and inserting "\$839";

(7) in subsection (g), by striking "\$1,029" and inserting "\$1,056";

(8) in subsection (h), by striking "\$1,195" and inserting "\$1,227";

(9) in subsection (i), by striking "\$1,344" and inserting "\$1,380";

(10) in subsection (j), by striking "\$2,239" and inserting "\$2,299";

(11) in subsection (k)—

(A) by striking "\$82" both places it appears

and inserting "\$84"; and

(B) by striking "\$2,785" and "\$3,907" and inserting "\$2,860" and "\$4,012", respectively;

(12) in subsection (l), by striking "\$2,785" and inserting "\$2,860";

(13) in subsection (m), by striking "\$3,073" and inserting "\$3,155";

(14) in subsection (n), by striking "\$3,496" and inserting "\$3,590";

(15) in subsections (o) and (p), by striking "\$3,907" each place it appears and inserting "\$4,012";

(16) in subsection (r), by striking "\$1,677" and "\$2,497" and inserting "\$1,722" and "\$2,564", respectively; and

(17) in subsection (s), by striking "\$2,506" and inserting "\$2,573".

(b) **ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.**—Section 1115(1) of such title is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "\$127" and inserting "\$130";

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "\$219" and "\$65" and inserting "\$224" and "\$66", respectively;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking "\$86" and "\$65" and inserting "\$88" and "\$66", respectively;

(4) in subparagraph (D), by striking "\$103" and inserting "\$105";



(5) in subparagraph (E), by striking “\$241” and inserting “\$247”; and

(6) in subparagraph (F), by striking “\$202” and inserting “\$207”.

(c) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS.—Section 1162 of such title is amended by striking “\$600” and inserting “\$616”.

(d) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES.—

(1) NEW LAW DIC.—Section 1311(a) of such title is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$967” and inserting “\$993”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$208” and inserting “\$213”.

(2) OLD LAW DIC.—The table in paragraph (3) of such section is amended to read as follows:

Pay grade	Monthly rate
E-1 .....	\$993
E-2 .....	\$993
E-3 .....	\$993
E-4 .....	\$993
E-5 .....	\$993
E-6 .....	\$993
E-7 .....	\$1,027
E-8 .....	\$1,084
E-9 .....	\$1,131
W-1 .....	\$1,049
W-2 .....	\$1,091
W-3 .....	\$1,123
W-4 .....	\$1,188
O-1 .....	\$1,049
O-2 .....	\$1,084
O-3 .....	\$1,160
O-4 .....	\$1,227
O-5 .....	\$1,351
O-6 .....	\$1,523
O-7 .....	\$1,645
O-8 .....	\$1,805
O-9 .....	\$1,931
O-10 .....	\$2,118

<sup>1</sup> If the veteran served as sergeant major of the Army, senior enlisted advisor of the Navy, chief master sergeant of the Air Force, sergeant major of the Marine Corps, or master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 1302 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$1,221.

<sup>2</sup> If the veteran served as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 1302 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$2,272.”.

(3) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR CHILDREN OR DISABILITY.—Section 1311 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “\$241” and inserting “\$247”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “\$241” and inserting “\$247”; and

(C) in subsection (d), by striking “\$115” and inserting “\$118”.

(e) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR CHILDREN.—

(1) DIC WHEN NO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Section 1313(a) of such title is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$410” and inserting “\$421”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$590” and inserting “\$605”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “\$767” and inserting “\$787”; and

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking “\$767” and “\$148” and inserting “\$787” and “\$151”, respectively.

(2) SUPPLEMENTAL DIC FOR CERTAIN CHILDREN.—Section 1314 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “\$241” and inserting “\$247”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “\$410” and inserting “\$421”; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “\$205” and inserting “\$210”.

## SEC. 5. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT TO IMPROVE BUSINESS PRACTICES OF VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a demonstration project under this section for the improvement of business practices of the Veterans Health Administration.

(2) PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACT.—To carry out the demonstration project, the Secretary shall enter into a performance-based contract for a contractor to carry out the functions specified in subsection (e).

(3) COST LIMITATION.—The total amount paid to the contractor under the contract may not exceed \$10,000,000.

(b) COMMENCEMENT AND DURATION OF PROJECT.—The demonstration project shall be conducted during the two-year period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning more than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SITES FOR CONDUCT OF PROJECT.—The Secretary shall conduct the demonstration project at two facilities, at least one of which shall be a medical center, of the Veterans Health Administration within the same service area (referred to as a Veterans Integrated Service Network) of the Veterans Health Administration. The two facilities at which the project is conducted shall be selected by the Secretary from among facilities that the Secretary determines have relatively low performance for recovery or collection of indebtedness from third-party payors under section 1729 of title 38, United States Code.

(d) SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR.—The Secretary shall carry out the process for selection of the contractor for the demonstration project so that the contractor to perform the contract is selected, and the contract is awarded, not later than three months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The contractor shall be an entity or organization that has significant experience in the administrative processing of health care charges and claims.

(e) FUNCTIONS OF CONTRACTOR.—The Secretary shall provide in the contract for the following functions of the contractor with respect to each facility at which the demonstration project is conducted:

(1) Detailed specification of existing business processes that the contractor determines are relevant to the capability of the facility to recover or collect indebtedness from third-party payors under section 1729 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) Reengineering of the business processes identified under paragraph (1), including provision for standardized application of such reengineered processes throughout the facility.

(3) Establish and implement a plan to transition from the business processes identified under paragraph (1) to the reengineered and standardized businesses established pursuant to paragraph (2).

(4) Establishment of a comprehensive database containing third-party payor information for veterans receiving health care and services at the facility.

(f) VHA PROJECT MANAGER.—As part of the demonstration project, the Secretary shall ensure that a Veterans Health Administration employee is designated to be the full-time project manager for the project and that such employee's duty station is at one of the facilities at which the project is conducted, with provision for visits as needed to the other facility at which the project is conducted.

(g) EMPLOYEE PROTECTION.—The Secretary shall administer the demonstration project so that during the period of the conduct of the demonstration project there is no reduction in active full-time equivalent employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs at the facilities at which the project is conducted that is attributable to the conduct of the demonstration project.

(h) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) PERIODIC PROGRESS REPORTS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) REPORTS REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress progress reports on the implementation of the demonstration project.

(B) TIME FOR PROGRESS REPORTS.—Such reports shall be submitted as expeditiously as feasible after the end of—

(i) the 60-day period and the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the 60-day period, the 90-day period, and the 180-day period beginning on the date of the award of the contract under subsection (d).

(C) MATTER TO BE INCLUDED.—Each report under this paragraph shall set out the progress to date of the demonstration project, including—

(i) before the contractor has been selected, progress toward selection of the contractor (identified by the steps in the acquisition process that have been accomplished and that remain to be accomplished); and

(ii) after the contractor has been selected—

(I) the contractor's progress in initiating and carrying out the demonstration project in accordance with the requirements of this section; and

(II) a copy of each contract under the demonstration project and any change order or modification to any such contract.

(2) INTERIM REPORTS ON PROJECT OPERATION.—After the completion of the first 12 months, and after the completion of the first 18 months, of the demonstration project, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an interim report on the operation of the demonstration project to that date. Each such report shall include the following:

(A) The assessment of the Secretary as to whether the rate of recovery or collection of indebtedness owed the United States from third-party payors has improved by reason of the project.

(B) The assessment of the Secretary as to the performance of the contractor.

(3) FINAL REPORT.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—After the conclusion of the demonstration project, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final report on the project.

(B) CONTENT.—The Secretary shall include in that report—

(i) the matters specified in paragraph (2);

(ii) the Secretary's estimate of cost savings to the Department attributable to the reengineered business processes implemented under the demonstration project, with supporting evidence and documentation for such estimate; and

(iii) the Secretary's recommendation for implementing on a permanent basis the recovery or collection system demonstrated in the project and expanding the project to other facilities of the Veterans Health Administration.

(C) SUBMISSION.—The final report shall be submitted not later than 90 days after the conclusion of the demonstration project.

(i) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW AND REPORTS.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the demonstration project on an ongoing basis.

(2) REPORTS.—The Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations concerning the demonstration project—

(A) after the operation of the demonstration project for a period of one year; and

(B) after the operation of the demonstration project for a period of two years.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the conduct of the demonstration project under this section the sum of \$10,000,000.

## SEC. 6. PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND CLINICAL CENTERS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:



**“§7329. Parkinson’s Disease research, education, and clinical centers**

“(a) The Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health and pursuant to the provisions of this section, shall designate six Department health-care facilities as the locations for centers of Parkinson’s Disease research, education, and clinical activities and (subject to the appropriation of sufficient funds for such purpose) shall establish and operate such centers at such locations in accordance with this section.

“(b) In designating locations for centers under subsection (a), the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health, shall—

“(1) designate each Department health-care facility that as of January 1, 2005, was operating a Parkinson’s Disease research, education, and clinical center unless (on the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health) the Secretary determines that such facility does not meet the requirements of subsection (c) or has not demonstrated effectiveness in carrying out the established purposes of such center or the potential to carry out such purposes effectively in the reasonably foreseeable future; and

“(2) assure appropriate geographic distribution of such facilities.

“(c) The Secretary may not designate a health-care facility as a location for a center under subsection (a) unless the peer review panel established under subsection (d) has determined under that subsection that the proposal submitted by such facility as a location for a new center under subsection (a) is among those proposals which have met the highest competitive standards of scientific and clinical merit, and the Secretary (upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health) determines that the facility has (or may reasonably be anticipated to develop) each of the following:

“(1) An arrangement with an accredited medical school which provides education and training in neurology and with which such facility is affiliated under which residents receive education and training in innovative diagnosis and treatment of chronic neurodegenerative diseases and movement disorders, including Parkinson’s disease.

“(2) The ability to attract the participation of scientists who are capable of ingenuity and creativity in health-care research efforts.

“(3) A policymaking advisory committee composed of appropriate health-care and research representatives of the facility and of the affiliated school or schools to advise the directors of such facility and such center on policy matters pertaining to the activities of such center during the period of the operation of such center.

“(4) The capability to conduct effectively evaluations of the activities of such center.

“(5) The capability to coordinate, as part of an integrated national system, education, clinical, and research activities within all facilities with such centers.

“(6) The capability to jointly develop a consortium of providers with interest in treating neurodegenerative diseases, including Parkinson’s Disease, and other movement disorders, at facilities without such centers in order to ensure better access to state-of-the-art diagnosis, care, and education for neurodegenerative disorders throughout the health care system.

“(7) The capability to develop a national repository for the collection of data on health services delivered to veterans seeking care for neurodegenerative diseases, including Parkinson’s Disease, and other movement disorders in the health care system.

“(d)(1) The Under Secretary for Health shall establish a panel to assess the scientific and clinical merit of proposals that are submitted to the Secretary for the establishment of new centers under this section.

“(2)(A) The membership of the panel shall consist of experts in neurodegenerative diseases,

including Parkinson’s Disease, and other movement disorders.

“(B) Members of the panel shall serve as consultants to the Department for a period of no longer than two years except in the case of panelists asked to serve on the initial panel as specified in subparagraph (C).

“(C) In order to ensure panel continuity, half of the members of the first panel shall be appointed for a period of three years and half for a period of two years.

“(3) The panel shall review each proposal submitted to the panel by the Under Secretary and shall submit its views on the relative scientific and clinical merit of each such proposal to the Under Secretary.

“(4) The panel shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

“(e) Before providing funds for the operation of any such center at a health-care facility other than a health-care facility designated under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall assure that the center at each facility designated under such subsection is receiving adequate funding to enable such center to function effectively in the areas of Parkinson’s Disease research, education, and clinical activities.

“(f) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the support of the research and education activities of the centers established pursuant to subsection (a). The Under Secretary for Health shall allocate to such centers from other funds appropriated generally for the Department medical services account and medical and prosthetics research account, as appropriate, such amounts as the Under Secretary for Health determines appropriate.

“(g) Activities of clinical and scientific investigation at each center established under subsection (a) shall be eligible to compete for the award of funding from funds appropriated for the Department medical and prosthetics research account and shall receive priority in the award of funding from such account insofar as funds are awarded to projects for research in Parkinson’s disease and other movement disorders.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7328 the following new item:

“7329. Parkinson’s Disease research, education, and clinical centers.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 7329 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1220, as amended, is one of the more important bills the committee brings to the floor each year. This bill, as amended, would authorize the cost-of-living adjustment effective December 1, 2005 for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their survivors.

The projected increase is 2.3 percent, but may be higher or lower depending on changes in the consumer price index. After our ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), speaks, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), a member of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, will provide a more detailed description of this provision.

H.R. 1220, as amended, will also authorize a demonstration project to improve the ability of the Veterans Health Administration to collect funds from third party insurance companies. Under certain circumstances, the VA may bill insurance companies for the treatment of conditions that are not a result of injuries or illnesses incurred or aggravated during military service. Despite improvements, weaknesses in VA’s billing and collection process still exist. Every dollar rightfully owed to the VA and not collected is a dollar less to veterans care.

We are working to ensure the VA can accurately forecast health care demand. We must also ensure that the system is able to collect a just debt. I expect that all revenue collected from the project will be returned to the VA medical center where the pilot occurs and not be subjected to appropriations offsets.

Finally, the bill would permanently authorize six Parkinson’s disease research, education and clinical centers. Parkinson’s disease affects as many as 1.5 million Americans. While treatment exists, we are still in search of a cure.

Currently, the VA has six of these centers. They provide researchers the ability to see results rapidly and put their knowledge to use in helping patients. These centers, working with other VA clinicians, treat tens of thousands of veterans with Parkinson’s disease. This section will ensure that the VA continues this invaluable research and treatment.

I want to thank my ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for his work on this part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) for his help and his work on this; the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), as always; and subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), for their continued efforts to ensure the value of veterans benefits does not erode as the cost of living increases.

H.R. 1220, the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2005 will help our service-disabled veterans and their survivors maintain the purchasing power of their benefits in 2006. Although we do not know at this time the amount of the increase until the consumer price index is calculated in October, I believe this bill will help VA beneficiaries keep the value of their benefits. No amount of money can adequately compensate our veterans for the loss of their health and families for the loss of loved ones. It is important that the benefits which our Nation provides to partially compensate for such losses do not lose their value over time.

In 2004, over 28,000 veterans in Nevada received disability benefits compensation or pension payments from the VA,

and thousands of Nevada family members and survivors received VA cash benefits. The actions we are taking here today will help Nevada veterans and families who depends on these VA benefits.

I am particularly pleased that the bill contains an amendment that I was pleased to offer to include the transitional DIC benefit in the COLA. Without the amendment, the value of the \$250 transitional benefit paid to surviving spouses with minor children for their first 2 years of eligibility would have eroded in value by 2006.

Mr. Speaker, this is the least we can do for our Gold Star wives and their children.

I am also pleased to note that the bill contains authority for six VA Parkinson's disease centers. I believe that the research conducted at those centers will improve the lives not only of the veterans with Parkinson's, but of many thousands of other Americans.

Veterans in Las Vegas are already reaping the benefits of the local VA's affiliation with the Southwest Center in West Los Angeles. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) in particular for bringing this to our attention and making sure that it was a top priority for the VA committee.

The bill also contains provisions for a demonstration project to improve VA's procedure for collecting money owed by third parties such as insurance companies when VA provides medical care for veterans with nonservice-connected conditions.

H.R. 1220 will receive my full support. It deserves the full support of all Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that H.R. 1220, in addition to providing veterans with needed health care, includes the cost-of-living adjustment as well. This will permanently authorize VA Parkinson's centers as well. Some 42,000 veterans with Parkinson's receive care at the VA.

In 5 years, an estimated 39,000 older veterans will have the disorder. Treatments exist for Parkinson's, but research continues to improve treatments and to search for a cure.

VA is on the cutting edge of research and treatment because of these centers. Veterans service organizations and Parkinson's advocates all support the permanent authorization of these centers.

While the bill does not also authorize VA's two multiple sclerosis centers, I continue to support the centers and hope they can work so we can get them properly authorized.

Authorizing the centers will make sure that the VA will continue to be a model of innovation in the delivery of health care and research for this chronic disease. This bill offers hope to veterans and others with Parkinson's. I ask my colleagues for their support.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time and for her leadership in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1220, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Act of 2005. I believe that this is a good bipartisan bill. Each year we pass the COLA for veterans. This ensures that veterans benefits maintain their value as the cost of living goes up. These benefits were earned by the men and women who have served our country and their families, and they should not be allowed to diminish.

These benefits are critical to helping many veterans and their families make ends meet. I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for her efforts to include a provision to improve benefits that I have been working on since I became a Member of Congress.

Last Congress in response to the VA evaluation, we passed legislation to provide an increase of \$250 to the monthly DIC benefits for surviving spouses with children under 18 years of age for the first 2 years of eligibility.

While I believe that we should make this benefit permanent, especially in light of our brave men and women giving their lives in Afghanistan and Iraq, the provision in today's bill is extremely important and will ensure that this benefit maintains its value over time.

Finally, I am pleased that this legislation will allow the VA to continue its important work on Parkinson's disease research. I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for their leadership in this very important legislation.

This is a good bill to help veterans and their families across the country. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1220, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act, which authorizes the annual cost-of-living adjustment for disabled veterans and their survivors.

I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for their leadership on the full committee and for their good work in shepherding this bill to the floor today. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, for their hard work and bipartisan leadership.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and am a proud cosponsor of the bill because it is an important way we can keep our Nation's promise to the veterans who have served. This legislation is aimed at improving the quality of life for disabled veterans and their families whose sacrifices and contributions to our great country should not be forgotten. I believe the way we treat our veterans is a moral issue and we need to do the right, moral, honorable thing with respect to disabled veterans and their families.

There are more than 3,000 veterans in my home State of South Dakota who received disability compensation last year, and tens of thousands more nationwide who rely on this annual cost of living increase to help support a dignified quality of life. With wounded young servicemen and women returning home by the thousands from battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan, we know there is a new and growing generation that is equally deserving of this modest increase to reflect a rising cost of living. It is imperative we work to provide this newest generation of veterans and their families with the benefits they have earned and deserve.

This bill will provide continuing assistance for these brave men and women who will forever live with the scars of their sacrifice. We must honor their service by considering veterans' care to be an ongoing cost of war.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for an amendment she offered in committee, which was passed and included in this bill to provide a cost of living adjustment in fiscal year 2006 for the additional payment of \$250 per month for the first 2 years of dependency indemnity compensation eligibility to surviving spouses with minor children.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) for his work to include a provision to provide for the establishment of Parkinson's Disease Research Education Clinical Centers in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Again, I am proud to support H.R. 1220, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), a member of the committee.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2005. H.R. 1220, as amended, would provide a cost-of-living adjustment, in the same amount as given to Social Security recipients, to disabled veterans and their surviving spouses. Veterans who receive disability compensation and survivors of certain veterans would receive a full COLA beginning on December 1 of this year. Congress has provided for these increases every fiscal year since 1976.

This bill would also codify the current amounts of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation. More than 2.6 million American veterans are receiving service-connected disability compensation. Many of them reside in my Congressional District. These benefits are paid monthly and range from \$108 per month for a 10 percent disability to \$2,299 for a 100 percent disability.

Additional monetary benefits are available for our most severely disabled veterans as well as those with dependents. Spouses of veterans who died on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability likewise are entitled to monetary compensation. Additional amounts are paid to survivors who are housebound or in need of aid and attendance or who have minor children.

Currently, more than 336,000 surviving spouses and children are receiving survivor benefits. The administration's fiscal year 2006 budget projects a 2.3 percent cost-of-living increase, but it may be higher or lower, depending on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The exact percentage will be calculated as of September 30 of this year.

I certainly want to thank the subcommittee's chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), respectively, for their work on H.R. 1220, as amended. I also want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), and ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) for their leadership in bringing the bill to the floor today, as well as the subcommittee staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1220, as amended.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from Nevada has 12 minutes remaining.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her outstanding, consistent leadership on behalf of our veterans. It is incredibly important.

I rise in full support of this increase of benefits of an across-the-board cost-of-living adjustment, but I rise particularly to speak about the authorization for the permanent Parkinson's disease research education. As the founder and co-chair of the Parkinson's Task Force, this is critically important. Many of our veterans, because of exposure to toxic elements, suffer from Parkinson's. This research is important. Some of their breakthroughs in these vet-

erans' research facilities have led to cures.

I rise in strong support of the overall bill and for this particular aspect that will help many veterans and many Americans across our Nation.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her leadership on veterans' issues.

I too rise in support of H.R. 1220, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act, and I would just like to speak briefly about two provisions in it.

This bill will, in December, provide a cost-of-living adjustment to the disability compensation received by our Nation's veterans, and to compensation received by their widows. A transitional benefit to widows with minor children, who will receive an extra \$250 per month for 2 years, is specifically included in this cost-of-living increase.

The compensation that veterans and their widows receive does not adequately compensate them for their losses, but we hope it will ease their burden and let them know our Nation is grateful. It is important this compensation keep abreast of the rising cost of living.

Another provision of the bill establishes, subject to appropriations, a Parkinson's Disease Research Educational and Clinical Center in six VA health care facilities, with appropriate geographical distribution of these centers. These centers would cooperate with an accredited medical school, one that provides education and training in neurology and attracts the participation of scientists who are capable of ingenuity and creativity in their research efforts.

The centers would provide the opportunity for VA clinicians to more fully understand Parkinson's Disease and collaborate on innovative treatments. The findings would be shared with facilities without research centers in order to ensure access to state-of-the-art information through our VA health care system. I am especially supportive of the provision which would advance our knowledge of Parkinson's Disease and would provide new treatments to those who are suffering.

So let us support H.R. 1220, but let us not get too self-congratulatory about this bill. It is a necessary bill. It is already provided for in the appropriations process, but the amount of money we are talking about in this bill is very, very small compared to the shortfall in the health care budget of the VA that we have been informed about by our new Secretary of VA.

Mr. Speaker, we are being irresponsible by not approving an adequate health care budget for our veterans. While today we approve the Disability Compensation COLA, we are still leaving our veterans health care short by billions of dollars, both in this year's and next year's budget.

And for those who say, well, we did not know about it, or it was a bad mathematical model that was used, these are rather ridiculous statements. The Independent Budget, which has been formulated by our veterans' service organizations in a very professional, a very detailed way, forecast the exact amount that we would need in the health care budget. While the chairman of our committee is going around searching for a right number, the number was right here in the independent budget.

And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats in this House tried to get this budget number into our budget. But were we allowed to? No, we were not allowed to vote on it in our committee. We were not allowed to vote on it on the floor. There were attempts to do that by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY). I had an amendment on the floor to put the required money in the budget that we were lacking for our veterans, and I was ruled out of order. Out of order to help our veterans? I will tell you what was out of order, and that was the process that the majority party set up.

Mr. Speaker, I have a thousand veterans in San Diego, California, who are on a waiting list to get into the VA health system. Does that sound like we were adequately funding our health care? We will have thousands of returning Veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan, many with PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder, who will not be able to get the required counseling at our VA centers. They will have to wait a year for a dental appointment. Is this supporting our troops? Is this showing how much we care about them?

Mr. Speaker, the way to show that we support our troops is to treat them well when they return home. We already have unsettling reports of veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. We have reports of veterans who suffer from PTSD probably, who are committing domestic violence, who have not gotten help from the VA and who may be on the streets already. We know what happens to the troops when they do not get the proper help. Half of the homeless on the streets today are Vietnam vets.

That is a tragedy, that is a disgrace, and an incredible immoral act that we have allowed this country to commit, to put our veterans on the streets. But the same thing is going to happen again. The same thing is going to happen again if we do not adequately fund this budget.

This House voted a week ago to put \$900 million into this year's budget. The Senate appropriated 1.5 billion. And the Veteran's Committee chairman said, oh, I do not know how they got their number. Well, that is the right number. We should vote for the Senate number. We can get this passed for veterans immediately, and then we can fix the 2006 budget in our regular appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, when the President says support our troops, support our troops, support our troops, and then does not provide the adequate funding when those troops come home, we are not doing the job that we should be doing to thank the veterans for their service. It is time to adequately fund the health care budget. It is time to listen to the Independent Budget. It is time for the chairman to listen to those who have been saying this for years. It is time to show proper respect for the veterans who have given us our freedom today.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge everybody to support H.R. 1220, everyone in this body. I do not think there is a reason why anybody should be voting against it. It is a very important piece of legislation. But I would like to echo what the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) has so eloquently stated in his floor remarks.

When I go home and talk to my veterans, they look to me for my help and my support in providing the health care that they so justly deserve and are entitled to. This Congress needs to step up to the plate and do what we know is right. We cannot continue short-changing our veterans. We cannot continue low-balling them, taking the lowest number, when we know it is the highest number that will barely suffice to provide for the health care needs of our veterans.

Our older veterans, Vietnam, Korea, World War II, some left in World War I, these men and women age, and they are continuing to age. We will have hundreds of thousands of veterans from our latest operations across the globe. Let us be farsighted. Let us be prepared for what is coming. And let none of us, none of us, have the temerity or the audacity to state that we did not know what the needs of the veterans were or what they will be confronted with in the near future. Let us all be on the same page, work in a bipartisan way, and let us do what is right for our veterans. And let us pass unanimously H.R. 1220.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. BUYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for his work and cooperation on this legislation. I also would like to say to him that he is a champion of Parkinson's Disease, and I am proud of his leadership by example and I am proud of his spirit to live and equally am proud to call him my friend.

I also commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), the chairman and ranking member on

the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, for their timely work concerning H.R. 1220, ensuring that disabled veterans and their survivors receive their COLA.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, for their hard work on reaching a compromise on the authorization of the demonstration project.

I am equally appreciative of the hard work of the staff directors of the majority and the minority, Art Wu and Len Sisteck for their work to improve the bill.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Veterans Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2005.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1220, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2005.

All too often, our veterans and their dependents are forced to pay unexpected medical fees and sometimes forced to juggle their finances just to make ends meet. By increasing the COLA we would help ease these burdens forced upon our veterans and their dependents. Our veterans deserve and need this assistance now.

This legislation is especially important to me because my Congressional District of El Paso, Texas is home to nearly 60,000 veterans.

These brave men and women have made tremendous sacrifices for our freedom, just as our servicemembers are currently doing in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to take care of our Nation's heroes so that we can fulfill our promises to our veterans after their service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee favorably passed H.R. 1220 and I would urge all my colleagues to do the same on the House floor.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1220, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act, which will increase, effective December 1, 2005, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain disabled veterans. As in previous years, these deserving men and women will receive the same cost-of-living-adjustment (COLA) that Social Security recipients are scheduled to receive, and as a cosponsor of H.R. 1220, I am pleased that we are acting to provide disabled veterans and their survivors with an annual COLA.

In the 108th Congress, we created an additional Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) payment of \$250 a month provided for the first two years of DIC eligibility to surviving spouses with minor children. This new benefit is aimed at easing the transition following the death of the servicemember or veteran. H.R. 1220, as amended, would also increase the amount of this additional assistance by the same COLA.

I am pleased that the amended bill also includes the provisions from H.R. 2988, the Vet-

erans Medical Care Revenue Enhancement Act of 2005. This is a bill that I introduced which authorizes a two-year demonstration project to improve business practices within the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) relating to third-party billing collections.

When Congress gave the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) the authority to collect payment from insurance companies for the treatment of non-service connected conditions, the funds collected were returned to the U.S. Treasury. At one point, the VA acknowledged that it did a poor job of collecting payments from insurance companies because it had no real incentive to do so. As a result, in 1997 Congress gave VA the authority to retain any third party collections recovered.

Despite improvements in VA's third-party collections, there continue to be weaknesses in the billing and collections processes that impair the VA's ability to maximize the amount of dollars paid by third-party insurance companies. In June, the VA briefed the staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that the Department has about \$600 million in outstanding payments that have been billed but not collected from third-party insurers. Collecting these funds would be a significant revenue source for the Department which could improve its ability to provide health care services to our Nation's veterans.

H.R. 1220 creates a modest \$10 million demonstration project to improve the VA's business practices at two sites that have low collections rates. It is our hope that this demonstration project will lead to improved collection practices by the VA.

Finally, H.R. 1220 would permanently authorize six Parkinson's Disease Research Education and Clinical Centers with the VA.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1220.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1220, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1220, as amended, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### MAKING PERMANENT THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO CONDUCT THE QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT PROGRAM

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 2385) to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2385

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. TEN-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO CONDUCT THE QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT PROGRAM.**

Section 4(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title 13, United States Code, to transfer responsibility for the quarterly financial report from the Federal Trade Commission to the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1983 (Public Law 97-454; 13 U.S.C. 91 note), is amended by striking "2005" and inserting "2015".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2385.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, H.R. 2385 reauthorizes the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report Program through 2015. The purpose of this bill is to ensure uninterrupted continuation of this well-established and indispensable program. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The Quarterly Financial Report, or QFR program, has been conducted uninterrupted since its inception in 1947. It provides ongoing, up-to-date statistics on the financial performance of the manufacturing, mining, wholesale and retail trade sectors of our economy. QFR is the sole source for this information.

Many public and private organizations rely on QFR data to make economic policy decisions based upon quality information. For example, the Commerce Department uses QFR data to develop the all-important gross domestic product and national incomes estimates. The Federal Reserve uses QFR data to assess industry debt structure, liquidity and profitability. The Treasury Department uses QFR to estimate corporate tax liability. And the Council of Economic Advisers uses QFR-based reports and analysis to develop economic policy proposals.

In short, the data gathered from the QFR program affects everyone from Wall Street to Main Street. The QFR is the Nation's most current and com-

prehensive source of data on corporate financial activity. Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan is on record stating that if anything, it would be desirable to expand the program to more sectors of the economy.

Originally, H.R. 2385 would have given the Secretary of Commerce permanent authority to conduct the QFR program. But after consultation with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we decided to amend the original bill by expanding the sunset clause from 5 years to 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill to reauthorize the time-tested QFR program. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 2385.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2385 as amended. This bill will reauthorize for 10 years the Quarterly Financial Report conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, and I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman TURNER) for moving this bill quickly through the committee process.

The reauthorization of this program expires this September, and it is very important that Congress gets this bill to the President before that deadline.

The QFR is critical data collection for economic statistics and policy. It is used by the Bureau of Economic Analysis in constructing the national income and product accounts and in calculating the gross domestic product. Quarterly Financial Report data are also used by the Federal Reserve in tracking the investments and liabilities of households and corporations. Quarterly Financial Report data are used by the Treasury Department in developing economic policy, and by the private sector in planning for the future.

There are two important issues that were considered by our committee in reauthorizing this data collection.

First, the Quarterly Financial Report is a mandatory survey. That means that businesses can be prosecuted if they do not provide the information the Census Bureau requests.

Secondly, like any survey, the Quarterly Financial Report imposes a certain burden on those who provide the information to the government. The Quarterly Financial Report is one of the few mandatory data collections authorized by Congress. The decennial census is mandatory, and is required by our Constitution. The Census Bureau also conducts the American Community Survey as a mandatory survey telling respondents that they are required by law to provide the requested information. That authority does not come from any explicit authorization by Congress, but rather through an interpretation of the law by the Office of Management and Budget.

As representatives of the people, Congress should monitor closely any information collected that carries with it a

penalty for not complying with the request. It is unfortunate that the mandatory authority is necessary for the Quarterly Financial Report. The Census Bureau has assured Congress that without this authority, the quality of the information collected would seriously decline. The Quarterly Financial Report asks businesses to provide detailed information on financial transactions during the quarter. In return, the government and the private sector use this information to form sound economic policy.

According to the Census Bureau, the basic form can take up to 10 hours to complete and the average is almost 4 hours. I believe that is a fair balance of burden and benefit. I am a strong supporter of a Quarterly Financial Report. Through my work on the Joint Economic Committee, I have seen firsthand the importance of the data provided by this survey. At the same time, I take my responsibility as an authorizer seriously. When we reauthorized this program in 1998, it was for 7 years. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to make this authorization for 10 years rather than a permanent authorization. I believe our committee should regularly review programs that place mandatory burdens on the public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I rise in favor of H.R. 2385, a bill that reauthorizes the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report program through the year 2015.

This important program provides data essential to calculating all aspects of national economy. Along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, I urge support of this necessary legislation.

The Quarterly Financial Report Program is our Nation's most comprehensive source of data on corporate financial activity. For the past 58 years, QFR data has been the basis of estimating the gross domestic product and the national income accounts. Consequently, countless public and private organizations rely on QFR data to make informed economic policy decisions every day.

Since 1983, the U.S. Census Bureau has successfully executed this valuable program. The Census Bureau has put forth laudable efforts to improve the process that provides the timely data. Specifically, the Census Bureau has significantly reduced time required for reporting the data by making it possible for companies to submit their surveys electronically by sending out filing reminders and providing help via the Census Website.

The Census Bureau has done an exceptional job conducting this survey for the Secretary of Commerce. That fact notwithstanding, it is the responsibility of Congress to reauthorize this program after a period of 10 years pending a thorough review on the condition that the Census Bureau continues to effectively administer this necessary economic survey.

Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, a non-controversial bill to reauthorize the time-tested Quarterly Financial Report Program. Passage of this legislation will ensure an uninterrupted continuation of this program.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman TURNER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman TOM DAVIS) for moving this bill through the subcommittee and full committee. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 2385 and urge its passage.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and the census in general. It is not only a foundation of facts on which our government and the private sector formulate public policy, it keeps our government fair.

Every 10 years based on census numbers, we redistribute power among the States in order to have a fair representation based on the numbers of people in our country, and it tells us who we are. It tells us about our diversity, it tells us about our growth. It is literally a portrait of our country every 10 years.

This particular report, the Quarterly Financial Report, is a very important part of that portrait. So I rise very strongly in support of this bill and the census in general. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman TURNER) for moving this bill so quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2385, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend by 10 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN F. WHITESIDE JOLIET POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2113) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 McDonough Street in Joliet, Illinois, as the "John F. Whiteside Joliet Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2113

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. JOHN F. WHITESIDE JOLIET POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 McDonough Street in Joliet, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "John F. Whiteside Joliet Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John F. Whiteside Joliet Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2113.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2113 introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) names this Post Office in Joliet, Illinois, as the John F. Whiteside Joliet Post Office Building. All 18 Illinois colleagues of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) have cosponsored this bill, and I am pleased to participate in this bill's consideration today.

John Whiteside was a long time opinion writer for the Joliet Herald News. Upon graduation from Northern Illinois University in 1971, he was hired by the Herald News which was the only newspaper he ever worked for.

For the first decade of his career, he worked as a beat and general assignment reporter. But in 1981, he began writing a daily column in the paper each weekday that became beloved by Joliet residents.

Mr. Whiteside wrote the vast majority of his columns on local matters. The most frequent and passionate topics on which he opined were matters of importance to community veterans and law enforcement officials. An Air Force veteran himself, Whiteside correctly viewed all of our Nation's military service veterans as American heroes.

He, likewise, had tremendous respect for police officers, once championing an attempt to raise funds for a police memorial in Joliet, among other efforts. For his eloquent advocacy over many years, it appears safe to say his subjects admired him, too.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, after battling cancer for 18 months, John Whiteside passed away on January 22, 2005. He was 61 years old. Days after he died, the front page of the Sunday Her-

ald News carried one final John Whiteside column. It was a posthumous article full of life's lessons that he had written in anticipation of his death. It was a touching end to a meaningful career that was cut short by a struggle with cancer.

□ 1130

His struggle was all the more touching because Whiteside had shared tales of his battle with melanoma with his readers from October 2003 through his passing in January 2005. On a personal note, my own father-in-law passed away from that same disease in January of this year, so I have some understanding of what Mr. Whiteside and his family went through. My sympathies go out to his family.

Mr. Speaker, John Whiteside was indeed a memorable resident of Joliet. Readers of the Herald News have spent a few moments with John every Monday through Friday for nearly a quarter of a century. For these reasons, it is fitting that the House would pass this bill to name a post office in his honor in his hometown of Joliet. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2113.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 2113, legislation naming a postal facility in Joliet, Illinois, after the late John Whiteside. This measure was introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), on May 5, 2005, and unanimously reported by the Government Reform Committee on June 16, 2005. H.R. 2113 enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Illinois State delegation.

John Whiteside worked at the Herald News, a suburban Chicago newspaper, for 34 years as a reporter and columnist. He was well respected in his community as someone who fought for the rights of veterans. As a veteran, one of his most notable achievements was to increase the number of honor guard volunteers for the Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery in Elwood, Illinois.

Sadly, John Whiteside passed away in January of cancer. Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend and colleague for renaming the Joliet post office after Mr. Whiteside and urge support for this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2113, legislation in tribute to John Whiteside which names the Joliet post office in his honor. John Whiteside was a citizen



and a local hero from the congressional district that I have the opportunity to represent, a man who touched so many lives through his daily commentary with the Herald News in Joliet, Illinois. John F. Whiteside inspired countless readers through his 34 years of service with the newspaper.

Let me begin by thanking Government Reform Committee Chairman TOM DAVIS; my friend Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania; my very, very good friend Mr. DAVIS of Illinois for joining me here on the floor today; and the support of the Government Reform Committee for this legislation, because today the House will be voting on legislation that I along with the entire delegation of Illinois, all 19 Republicans and Democrats, have cosponsored, legislation naming the Joliet post office the John F. Whiteside Joliet Post Office Building. I would note that this post office building is on McDonough Avenue just a few short blocks from the Joliet Herald News offices where he put in so many hours and so many days over the years. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation today.

John Whiteside started his career with the Joliet Herald News in 1971 as a beat reporter and became a true storyteller in 1981 when he started his own personal daily column. Many of his columns focused on the good nature of people, and he especially loved writing about police officers and veterans because he looked to police officers and veterans as his heroes. Readers appreciated his dedication and his advocacy for veterans. John himself was a United States Air Force veteran and wrote thousands of stories about the concerns of local veterans.

One of the biggest veterans accomplishments for John, something he was so proud of and something he invested so much time and personal effort in, was helping organize the honor guard units for military funerals at the Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery located outside of Joliet at the former Joliet arsenal. Mr. Whiteside's legacy included helping to raise funds that equipped squad cars in Will County with video cameras to help nail drunk drivers. He is also noted for reviving police interest in the unsolved disappearance of Joliet newspaper editor Molly Zelko in 1957.

Mr. Whiteside was a recipient of many awards during his 34-year career with the Herald News in Joliet, Illinois, and some of these awards and recognitions included the Will County Sheriff's Department 2004 lifetime achievement award; Joliet area historical museum war heroes gallery named in John Whiteside's honor; and an Illinois State house resolution in 2004 honoring his long service to the Herald News and the Joliet community, just to name a few.

As a columnist, John knew how to connect with every reader through the emotions he brought to his stories. He brought even more emotion to them when he found out he had melanoma

cancer in the fall of 2003. Through his trials and tribulations, he chose to share his cancer story with his readers and gave many other cancer victims empathy and hope in their own troubled times.

On January 22, 2005, John Whiteside lost his battle with cancer, leaving behind his wife, Mary Jane, and his daughter, Shelley. He so enjoyed spending time with his family and will be remembered for the time he spent creating birdhouses out of wood in the basement of his home.

In Mr. Whiteside's very last column, he gave some very valuable advice. He said, "Live every second of every minute of every hour of every day you are given on this good Earth. Look for the positive. Search for the smile. Seek out the good. It is all around you if you just take the time to recognize it."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to share John Whiteside's last column with my colleagues. This column, of course, was published after John passed away on the front page of Joliet Herald News. It is entitled, "Lifelong Dream Ends in Final Column," published in the Herald News on January 23, 2005.

"If you're reading this, I have already looked upon the face of God. And I pray that he has nodded his head in a positive way.

"I had a good life. A good wife and daughter. Good friends and good times. A good job.

"But, sure, I have some regrets. I did some wrongs at times, which I hope I have been forgiven for doing. The last months of my life were full of blessings. So many of you prayed for me and wrote of your concern for my health. I had hoped for a miracle, but it wasn't meant to be. I guess I completed my purpose in being in this world.

"In heaven, well, I don't expect pearly gates and streets of gold. But I know I'll find a place full of goodness, compassion, and mercy. There will be no evil. No meanness. No brutal crime and war. No disease and illness. No jealousy and no hatred. No greed. And no politics.

"If I am allowed to enter this place, I believe that I will be united with my lost loved ones, including my dad, Uncle John, Aunt Mary, Grandma and a whole bunch of great uncles and aunts who loved me as a child. I'll see my buddies like Happy Chopp, Dan Stobbe and Ralph Wick.

"As I visualize my role in heaven, maybe God needs a birdhouse builder to construct shelters for his birds which sing lovely songs. I really have enjoyed creating birdhouses. Some of my happiest hours were in my basement workshop cutting and hammering on them.

"But the real love of my life, outside of my wife and daughter, has been this column. From the time I was old enough to dream, I wanted to be a writer. I wanted to be a storyteller. And I even thought that God told me as a child that I would be a writer.

"The column gave me an outlet to hook words together and tell you a story on a daily basis. I wrote thousands and remembered most of them. But I couldn't remember the names. I thought that the Lord directed me at times to tell certain tales, which just seemed to fall into my lap. Someone told someone to call John Whiteside because they recognized that as my kind of story.

"Two of my very best friends have been storytellers, too, Marx Gibson and Lonny Cain. Both were mentors as well as buddies.

"In my last days, cancer changed me. I believe it made me a better man. It brought me closer to my wife and daughter. It made me more compassionate to mankind. It brought me honors from friends, colleagues and people.

"I have no major regrets. I called them, for the most part, like I saw them. But I wasted time when I should have been living every moment to the fullest.

"If I have any advice to pass on to the rest of you, it's all about living. Living every second of every minute of every hour of every day you are given on this good Earth. And don't get caught up in any form of hatred. Hatred, anger, and the negative only feeds upon you and will destroy you. Look for the positive. Search for the smile. Seek out the good. It is all around you if you just take the time to recognize it. And laugh a lot, because laughter is healthy.

"As my storytelling days have ended, now perhaps I have the final chapter of what happened to Molly Zelko. Maybe God will allow me to interview her if she made it upstairs, too.

"But, no, Molly isn't what I consider my best accomplishments. They include helping with the honor guard system at the national cemetery, the Taylor Pirc video camera project, writing veterans' memories and building the police memorial in front of the courthouse.

"But most of all, I like my people stories. Stories about ordinary folks caught up in some form of human drama. My favorite saying was, everyone has a story to tell if you just listen. I believed that all of my journalism life.

"But now it's over. Good-bye, my friends. Thanks for reading my stuff. God bless you all.

"At this time, my only regret is that I can't write a column and share with you what is happening to me right now.

"P.S. I don't have a phone number to accept calls anymore. But maybe I can hear a few prayers coming my way."

That final column published in the Joliet Herald News on January 23 of this year says so much about John Whiteside, and he wrote it in his own words.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, I ask again that you join me in honoring and remembering this extraordinary man who touched so many lives in so



many ways and I ask for an "aye" vote on H.R. 2113.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for his work on H.R. 2113.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2113.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### VINCENT PALLADINO POST OFFICE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2183) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 Tompkins Avenue in Staten Island, New York, as the "Vincent Palladino Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2183

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. VINCENT PALLADINO POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 Tompkins Avenue in Staten Island, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Vincent Palladino Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Vincent Palladino Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2183 honors the late president of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, Vincent Palladino. Palladino passed away unexpectedly at his home in nearby Arlington, Virginia, at the age of 69 in December 2004. He was a native of Staten Island, New York, which is in the district of the distinguished sponsor of H.R. 2183 and my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA). I congratulate the gentleman for offering this important measure.

After serving his Nation in the Air Force, Palladino began his lifelong career in and around the United States Postal Service. He started working as a letter carrier in Staten Island in 1960. He was later promoted to foreman of mails and then station manager in 1970. Last August, Vincent Palladino was elected to his seventh consecutive 2-year term as president of the postal supervisors association. NAPS is an organization that represents more than 35,000 first-line postal supervisors who work in facilities where employees process and deliver the mail.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear he was a knowledgeable, empathetic and effective leader and advocate in the postal community, and that is why this post office naming in his honor is so appropriate. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2113.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H.R. 2183, legislation designating the postal facility in Staten Island, New York, after the late Vincent Palladino. This measure was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) on May 5, 2005, and unanimously reported by the Government Reform Committee on June 16, 2005. H.R. 2183 enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire New York delegation.

□ 1145

Born in New Brighton, New York, Vince Palladino joined the post office after serving in the U.S. Air Force. In 1962, he began his career as a letter carrier in the Rosebank Post Office. He held several supervisory positions, including station manager. In 1986, he was elected secretary of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, NAPS, and in 1992, he was elected the organization's President.

Mr. Speaker, as president of NAPS, Vince Palladino spearheaded a very impressive management association of over 35,000 active and retired supervisors, managers, and postmasters. Throughout his years as president, Vince testified before the Committee on Government Reform on many occasions. He fought hard to improve the United States Postal Service and pressed for changes in performance and labor management relations and reforms in pay.

Vince Palladino left his friends at NAPS and the postal service with a very simple, yet poignant message: "Be fair and honest."

Sadly, after serving as president for 12 years, Mr. Palladino died in December, 2004, at the age of 69.

Mr. Speaker I commend my colleague for naming the post office after Vince Palladino. How fitting a tribute. And I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), the author of H.R. 2183.

(Mr. FOSSELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time and the ranking member for their support.

And today I request the House approve the naming of a post office in my district after Vincent Palladino. Vincent, who passed away last December, was the president of the National Association of Postal Supervisors for 12 years, ending in 2004. He was also a native of Staten Island, New York, in my district.

Vincent was kind-hearted, compassionate, outgoing, and had an unquenchable thirst for helping his friends and neighbors. Vincent made his community a better place to live and touched the lives of those around him. And although his professional obligations carried him far and wide, his heart was always in Staten Island.

He began his career as a letter carrier in the Rosebank Post Office in 1962. He held numerous supervisory positions in Staten Island, including station manager of the Rosebank Post Office and operations manager for all Staten Island post offices. In 1986, he was elected secretary of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, which represents more than 35,000 active and retired supervisors, managers, and postmasters who work for or who retired from the United States Postal Service. In 1992, he was elected president of NAPS and held that post for 12 years.

Vincent brought his life lessons learned on the streets of Rosebank and Arlington to that position and was a strong advocate for all those postal workers he led. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all those postal workers for the job they do every day. I know Vincent would stand up and correct me if I failed to mention them and how much he appreciated, like we all do, their work. I would also like to thank Vincent's family, especially his children, Anthony, Nicholas, Regina, Renee, and Mary Lou, for their support of this fine man.

Born in 1935, Vincent also served his country in the Armed Forces, that is, in the United States Air Force, from 1955 to 1959. Today we honor Vincent's lifetime hard work and achievement by asking the House to approve the measure to rename the Rosebank Post Office in his honor, where he got his start. And might I add, he also happened to be my family's letter carrier in the early 1960s when he started.

I would like to thank the fellow members of the New York delegation

for their unanimous support of this legislation and all those who have cosponsored the bill. Like many American success stories, and Vincent Palladino was one of them, he never forgot where he came from. He may have lived his last years in Arlington, Virginia, but his heart and his family will always be in Staten Island.

I thank the Members for their support.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge support from all Members for this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2183.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### J.M. DIETRICH NORTHEAST ANNEX

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2630) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1927 Sangamon Avenue in Springfield, Illinois, as the "J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2630

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. J.M. DIETRICH NORTHEAST ANNEX.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1927 Sangamon Avenue in Springfield, Illinois, and known as the Northeast Annex, shall be known and designated as the "J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) introduced H.R. 2630, which redesignates the postal facility located at 1927 San-

gamon Avenue in Springfield, Illinois, as the "J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex." All members of the Illinois State congressional delegation have cosponsored this legislation, and I support its passage.

James Michael Dietrich was an earnest lifelong postal employee. He began his career as a letter carrier in 1970. In 1983 he was promoted to supervisor of Delivery and Collections, and finally he earned the position of Customer Service Supervisor in 1989. Regardless of his rank or duties with the postal service, Dietrich gained the respect of his peers through his friendly demeanor, leadership, and hard work.

Mike Dietrich died in September, 2003. He was a tremendous asset to the postal service and a terrific individual who is worthy of this fitting honor by the House. So I encourage my colleagues to join with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and me in renaming the Northeast Annex in Springfield, Illinois as the "J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 2630, legislation redesignating a postal facility in Springfield, Illinois, after the late James Michael Dietrich. This measure was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) on May 25, 2005, unanimously reported by the Committee on Government Reform on June 16, 2005. H.R. 2630 enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Illinois State delegation.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to join my colleagues in praising the hard work of postal employees. And the late James Michael "Mike" Dietrich was a postal supervisor long remembered for his dedication to his job, the employees, and the United States Postal Service.

James Dietrich was a lifelong employee of the postal service. After serving in the U.S. Army, he joined the postal service as a letter carrier. He was promoted to supervisor of Delivery and Collections in 1983 and later to supervisor of customer service in 1989. He handled daily assignments and personnel staffing. He was known for his patience, problem solving, and recognized as the "go to" man.

Sadly, he died unexpectedly in September of 2003. Mr. Dietrich's colleagues have described him as a hard worker and a fantastic human being. I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the memory of Mr. Dietrich and urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to read a letter that I received from the National Association of Letter Carriers, Abraham Lincoln Branch No. 80, Springfield, Illinois:

"Dear Congressman LaHood: The Letter Carriers of Springfield are requesting that the Northeast Annex, 1927 Sangamon Avenue, Springfield, Illinois, be renamed the J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex.

"James Michael 'Mike' Dietrich died unexpectedly September, 2003, just over 1 month short of his retirement. Mike was a lifelong employee of the United States Postal Service. He served in the U.S. Army from 1968 through 1970. After an honorable discharge from the Army, he was hired as a letter carrier.

"In May, 1983, he was promoted to supervisor, Delivery and Collections. He was charged with the supervision of approximately 50 letter carriers and collectors. It was his responsibility to see that those in his section were properly trained and successfully functioned as city carriers. In 1989 he was promoted to supervisor, Customer Service. He managed the daily operations of a group of carriers numbering about 100. He also handled scheduling of day-to-day assignments as well as annual and incremental leave for the entire group of Springfield city carriers and collectors. During his service, he received several safety and leadership awards, and in 2002, became the OSHA record-keeper.

"Mike was not only a great supervisor but he was a fantastic human being. You would be hard pressed to find a U.S. Postal Service employee in Springfield, Illinois, who would have a bad word to say about Mike. He was a man of never-ending patience. He was someone we could all go to with a question and know we would come away with a reasonable and correct answer. And if one of us had a problem, he was our sounding board and mentor, one who can never be replaced.

"Mike and his wife, Carol, raised a beautiful family of six girls for whom they worked hard to provide college educations. They are all now productive adults, some beginning families of their own. I know his career was important to him, but I also know that he considered his family to be his greatest accomplishment.

"Not a day goes by that Mike's name is not uttered by someone on the workroom floor. We all feel it is only fitting that we work in the J.M. Dietrich Northeast Annex.

"Thank you for the consideration" of renaming the annex.

"Pat Kruger, letter carrier, Springfield, Illinois."

Mr. Speaker, I read this letter because it is the opportunity for me to thank the letter carriers that work with Mike, to thank them for recognizing all of his accomplishments and

thank them for bringing to my attention the opportunity to name the facility that they all work in and that he worked in and that he accomplished so much with.

And, too, a word about the letter carriers. We have the greatest mail delivery system in the world, anywhere in the world, right here in our country. And it is thanks to the people like Mike and all the people who work in Springfield and all the people who work in the postal service that letters get delivered on time 6 days a week in a professional manner, and I know all Americans appreciate that. And I am grateful to the letter carriers of Abraham Lincoln Branch No. 80 for bringing this to my attention and the ability of this committee to bring this to the floor as a bill that will become law and to have this facility named in Mike's honor.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2630.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EAST ASIA SECURITY ACT OF 2005

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3100) to authorize measures to deter arms transfers by foreign countries to the People's Republic of China.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3100

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "East Asia Security Act of 2005".

#### SEC. 2. STATEMENTS OF POLICY.

Congress—

(1) previously expressed its strong concerns in House Resolution 57 of February 2, 2005, and Senate Resolution 91 of March 17, 2005, with the transfer of armaments and related technology to the People's Republic of China by member states of the European Union, which increased eightfold from 2001 to 2003, and with plans to terminate in the near future the arms embargo they imposed in 1989 following the Tiananmen Square massacre;

(2) welcomes deferral of a decision by the European Council to terminate its arms embargo following adoption of those Resolutions, the President's visit to Europe, and growing concern among countries in the regions and the general public on both sides of the Atlantic;

(3) welcomes the decision by the European Parliament on April 14, 2005, by a vote of 421 to 85, to oppose the lifting of the European Union's arms embargo on the People's Republic of China, and resolutions issued by a number of elected parliamentary bodies in Europe also opposing the lifting of the arms embargo;

(4) also welcomes the onset of a strategic dialogue between the European Commission

and the Government of the United States on the security situation in East Asia, through which it is hoped a greater understanding will emerge of the consequences of European assistance to the military buildup of the People's Republic of China for peace and stability in that region, to the security interests of the United States and its friends and allies in the region, and, in particular, to the safety of United States Armed Forces whose presence in the region has been a decisive factor in ensuring peace and prosperity since the end of World War II;

(5) hopes that a more intensive dialogue with Europe on this matter will clarify for United States friends and allies in Europe how their "non-lethal" arms transfers improve the force projection of the People's Republic of China, are far from benign, and enhance the prospects for the threat or use of force in resolving the status of Taiwan, a troubling prospect made more ominous by recent adoption of a new law by the Chinese National People's Congress expressly authorizing the use of force;

(6) also hopes that this dialogue will result in an important new consensus between the United States and its European partners on the need for coordinated policies which encourage the development of democracy in the People's Republic of China and which discourage, not assist, China's unjustified military buildup and pursuit of weapons that threaten its neighbors;

(7) however, deeply regrets that none of the European friends and allies of the United States who have been transferring arms to the People's Republic of China has announced a cessation or even a temporary halt to those transfers while this new dialogue with the United States ensues, and notes with concern that such European friends and allies have provided little, if any, transparency to the United States Government into the full range and capabilities of all of the armaments and related technology that they have transferred to date and continue even now to do so;

(8) is further troubled by public reports describing well known European companies as suppliers to weapons programs of the People's Republic of China, who are also participants in numerous sensitive United States Government weapons programs, and the increased risks of diversion of United States weapons technology to China inherent in such an undesirable situation; and

(9) in view of the gravity of European arms sales to the People's Republic of China, which have not abated, believes it is necessary to make provision for greater scrutiny and oversight with respect to those areas of international armament cooperation that present increased levels of risk to the security interests of the United States and to authorize appropriate measures which the President may draw on in deterring foreign support for China's military buildup in order to safeguard the national security interests of the United States and peace and security in East Asia.

#### SEC. 3. REPORT ON FOREIGN MILITARY EXPORTS TO CHINA.

(a) REPORT.—The President shall, at the times specified in subsection (b), transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies every person of a member country of the European Union, and any other foreign person the President may consider appropriate, with respect to whom there is credible information indicating that the person, on or after January 1, 2005, exported to—

(1) the People's Republic of China any item on the Wassenaar Munitions List of July 12, 1996, and subsequent revisions; or

(2) the military, intelligence, or other security forces of the People's Republic of China—

(A) any item on the Wassenaar List of Dual Use Goods and Technologies of July 12, 1996, and subsequent revisions; or

(B) any other dual use item if the item is intended, entirely or in part, for use with an item described in paragraph (1).

(b) TIMING OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be transmitted not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not later than the end of each 12-month period thereafter.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—A foreign person is not required to be identified in a report required under subsection (a) if the person—

(1) was identified in a previous report transmitted under subsection (a) on account of a particular export, except to the extent that the export may have continued, involved additional transfers, or was larger, more significant, or different in nature than described in the previous report;

(2) was engaged solely in an export on behalf of, or in concert with, the Government of the United States; or

(3) was engaged in an export which, as determined by the President, would be exempt from the restrictions of section 902(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note), if the export were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, by reason of the issuance of a report under section 902(b) of such Act.

(d) FORM.—If the President considers it appropriate, reports transmitted under subsection (a), or appropriate parts thereof, may be transmitted in classified form.

#### SEC. 4. REPORT ON CHINA ARMS TRANSFER POLICIES OF COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN UNITED STATES DEFENSE COOPERATIVE PROJECTS; CERTAIN LICENSE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress is concerned with the significant additional risk of unlawful use and diversion of sensitive United States weapons system research, design, and development arising from cooperative research and development projects with foreign governments and foreign persons who may also transfer arms and related technology to the People's Republic of China.

(b) REPORT.—The President shall, at the times specified in subsection (c), transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(1) identifies every foreign government with respect to which the United States is carrying out a cooperative project described in subsection (d) and whose policies or practices, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, permit the export of any item described in paragraph (1), or subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), of section 3(a); and

(2) describes the cooperative projects and policies or practices referred to in paragraph (1) of every foreign government identified under such paragraph.

(c) TIMING OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (b)—

(1) shall be transmitted not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not later than the end of each 12-month period thereafter; and

(2) may be included in the report required under section 3, as the President determines appropriate.

(d) COOPERATIVE PROJECTS.—The cooperative projects referred to in subsection (b) are projects carried out under section 27 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2767) or section 2350a, 2358, or a memorandum of understanding under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code.

(e) LICENSE REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a license under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) shall be required for the export of defense articles or defense services by any person who is not an officer or employee of the Government of the United States in furtherance of a cooperative project described in subsection (d) with a country identified in a report transmitted under subsection (b).

(2) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—The issuance of a license pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to the same requirements as are applicable to the export of items described in section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) (without regard to the dollar amount requirements relating to contracts contained in such section), including the transmittal of information and the application of congressional review procedures in accordance with such section.

#### **SEC. 5. CERTAIN FOREIGN OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF DEFENSE ARTICLES IN THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—Congress determines that special care should be taken by the United States with respect to foreign persons who sell arms and related technology to the People's Republic of China, while simultaneously seeking ownership of United States defense articles or defense services, including the results of United States Government funded defense research and development, through the acquisition or control of United States defense firms, directly or through their subsidiaries and affiliates based in the United States.

(b) **LICENSE REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The President shall require a license pursuant to regulations issued under section 38(g)(6) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(g)(6)) for the transfer of ownership or control of United States defense articles or defense services arising from the acquisition or control of a person required to be registered under section 38(b)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(1)), or any subsidiary, division, affiliate or other entity thereof, whenever the person gaining acquisition or control is—

(A) a foreign national of the People's Republic of China or a foreign person otherwise subject to the jurisdiction, ownership, or control of the People's Republic of China;

(B) a foreign person identified in a report transmitted under section 3 or having its principal place of business in a country described in a report transmitted under section 4; or

(C) a United States person owned or controlled by a foreign person, including a subsidiary or affiliate of a foreign person described in subparagraph (B).

(2) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.**—A license under section 38(g)(6) of the Arms Export Control Act for a person described in paragraph (1)(A) shall not be issued until 30 days after the date on which the President transmits a report that contains a determination of the President that—

(A) the Government of the People's Republic of China meets the requirements of section 902(b)(1) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note); or

(B) it is in the national interest of the United States to issue the license.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—The issuance of a license pursuant to subsection (b) shall be subject to the same requirements as are applicable to the export of items described in section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) (without regard to the dollar amount requirements relating to contracts contained in such section), including the transmittal of information and the application of congressional review

view procedures in accordance with such section.

(d) **EXCEPTION.**—The issuance of a license pursuant to subsection (b) shall not be required in the case of an amendment to a munitions license or a change in registration arising from a sale or transfer of ownership or control of United States defense articles or defense services to a person described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) that was approved prior to the date of enactment of this Act unless the President determines that it is in the national security interests of the United States to require the issuance of a new license pursuant to subsection (b).

#### **SEC. 6. CHINESE MILITARY END USE OF DUAL USE EXPORTS.**

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—Congress welcomes the understanding reached at the Wassenaar Arrangement's December 2003 plenary meeting to require governmental authorization for the transfer of non-listed dual use items intended for military end use in a destination subject to any relevant regional arms embargo or to any United Nations Security Council resolution.

(b) **LICENSE REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The President shall require a license under the Export Administration Regulations for the export of any item described in paragraph (1), or subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), of section 3(a) that is not subject to a license under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) if the item is intended for military end use by the People's Republic of China.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the President should not approve a license pursuant to paragraph (1) unless the President determines that approval is important to counterterrorism, non-proliferation, or other national security interests of the United States.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—The issuance of a license pursuant to subsection (b) shall be subject to the same requirements as are applicable to the export of items described in section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) (without regard to the dollar amount requirements relating to contracts contained in such section), including the transmittal of information and the application of congressional review procedures in accordance with such section.

(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term "military end use" means, with respect to an item, the item is or may be intended, entirely or in part, for use in conjunction with an item described on the Wassenaar Munitions List of July 12, 1996, and subsequent revisions.

#### **SEC. 7. APPLICATION OF MEASURES TO CERTAIN FOREIGN PERSONS.**

(a) **APPLICATION OF MEASURES.**—Subject to sections 8 and 9, the President may apply with respect to any foreign person (including a foreign government) identified in a report transmitted under section 3, and shall apply with respect to any foreign person (including a foreign government) identified in more than one report transmitted under section 3, any or all of the following measures:

(1) **RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—Denial of participation in existing and new cooperative research and development programs and projects under section 27 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2767) or sections 2350a, 2358, or a memorandum of understanding under 2531 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) **CONTROL OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE FIRMS.**—Prohibition of ownership and control of any business organization required to be registered with the United States Government as a manufacturer or exporter of defense articles or defense services under sec-

tion 38(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(1)).

(3) **SECURITY ASSISTANCE.**—Prohibition on participation in any foreign military sales under chapter 2 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761 et seq.) or any design and construction sales under chapter 2A of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2769).

(4) **MUNITIONS LIST APPROVALS.**—Prohibition on licenses and other forms of approval under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) for the export of any item on the United States Munitions List as in effect on August 8, 1995.

(5) **DUAL USE APPROVALS.**—Prohibition on licenses and other forms of approval for dual use goods or technology, the export of which is controlled under the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act) or the Export Administration Regulations.

(b) **APPLICATION OF ADDITIONAL MEASURES.**—Subject to sections 8 and 9, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, with respect to any foreign person (including a foreign government) identified in a report transmitted under section 3, and shall, with respect to any foreign person (including a foreign government) identified in more than one report transmitted under section 3—

(1) suspend the use of any license exemption and expedited license procedure established in the International Traffic in Arms Regulations or other provisions of law for the export or temporary import of defense articles and defense services;

(2) require the execution of a non-transfer and end use certificate for the export of any defense articles and defense services; and

(3) require, as a condition of issuance of any license for the export of defense articles and defense services, United States access to and verification of the items after the export of the items or alternative measures to ensure compliance with restrictions on the transfer of the items to third-parties.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF MEASURES.**—Measures applied pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) shall be effective with respect to a foreign person (including a foreign government) no later than—

(1) 30 days after the report identifying the foreign person is transmitted, if the report is transmitted on or before the date required by section 3(b); or

(2) on the date that the report identifying the foreign person is transmitted, if the report is transmitted more than 30 days after the date required by section 3(b).

(d) **DURATION OF MEASURES.**—Measures applied pursuant to subsection (a) shall be for a period of 2 years or longer, as the President determines appropriate. Measures applied pursuant to subsection (b) shall be, at a minimum, consistent with the duration of the license and the normal requirements for record keeping established in the International Traffic in Arms Regulations or longer, as the President determines appropriate.

(e) **PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.**—The application of measures to a foreign person pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) shall be announced by notice published in the Federal Register, except if the President determines that doing so would be inconsistent with the protection of classified information.

#### **SEC. 8. PROCEDURES IF DISCRETIONARY MEASURES ARE NOT APPLIED.**

(a) **REQUIREMENT TO NOTIFY CONGRESS.**—If the President does not exercise the authority of subsection (a) or (b) of section 7 to apply any or all of the discretionary measures described in such subsection with respect to a foreign person identified in a report transmitted under section 3, the President shall

so notify the appropriate congressional committees not later than the effective date under section 7(c) for measures with respect to that person.

(b) **WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION.**—Any notification transmitted by the President under subsection (a) shall include a written justification describing in detail the facts and circumstances relating specifically to the foreign person identified in a report transmitted under section 3 that support the President's decision not to exercise the authority of subsection (a) or (b) of section 7 with respect to that person.

(c) **FORM.**—If the President considers it appropriate, the notification of the President under subsection (a), and the written justification under subsection (b), or appropriate parts thereof, may be transmitted in classified form.

#### **SEC. 9. DETERMINATIONS EXEMPTING FOREIGN PERSONS FROM MANDATORY MEASURES.**

(a) **WAIVER.**—Any mandatory measure described in section 7 shall not apply with respect to a foreign person if the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a determination of the President that—

(1) on the basis of information provided by that person or the foreign government having primary jurisdiction over the person, the person did not, on or after January 1, 2005, knowingly export to the People's Republic of China the item the apparent export of which caused the person to be identified in a report transmitted under section 3; or

(2) the foreign government having primary jurisdiction over the person has entered into a written agreement with the United States which—

(A) is binding under international law;

(B) prohibits further exports of any item described in paragraph (1), or subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), of section 3(a) by any person subject to its jurisdiction;

(C) is supported by the foreign government's adoption of policies and procedures providing for credible implementation of the requirements in subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(D) does not constrain the President's authority to impose measures under this act in the event of a future export of concern by the same or other persons subject to the jurisdiction of the foreign government party to the agreement; and

(E) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees 30 days prior to its entry into force.

(b) **ADDITIONAL WAIVER.**—Any mandatory measure described in section 7 shall not apply to a foreign person if the President determines that it is important to the counterterrorism, nonproliferation, or other national security interests of the United States and transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a report in writing that contains such determination.

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the President should—

(1) strengthen international coordination and execution of arms export policy through the development of bilateral and multilateral agreements under subsection (a)(2), particularly with member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Japan, Australia and New Zealand, and exercise the waivers provided under this section in all appropriate instances that further this objective; and

(2) whenever the President determines that the measures described in section 7 should be applied, that the measures be applied comprehensively with respect to the affected foreign person's affiliates and subsidiaries, wherever located, in order to deter to the fullest extent possible a recurrence or continuation of the export giving rise to the President's determination.

(d) **FORM.**—If the President considers it appropriate, the determination and report of the President under subsection (a), or appropriate parts thereof, may be transmitted in classified form.

#### **SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(2) **DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES.**—The term "defense articles and defense services" has the meaning given the term in section 47(7) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794 note).

(3) **DUAL USE.**—The term "dual use" means, with respect to goods or technology, those goods or technology that are specifically designed or developed for civil purposes but which also may be used or deployed in a military or proliferation mode. Such term does not include purely commercial items.

(4) **EXPORT.**—The term "export" has the meaning given that term in section 120.17 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations, and includes re-exports, transfers, and retransfers by any means.

(5) **EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS.**—The term "Export Administration Regulations" means those regulations contained in sections 730 through 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(6) **FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.**—The term "foreign government" has the meaning given the term in section 38(g)(9)(B) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(g)(9)(B)).

(7) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term "foreign person" has the meaning given the term in section 38(g)(9)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(g)(9)(C)).

(8) **GOOD.**—The term "good" has the meaning given the term in section 16(3) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415(3)).

(9) **INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC IN ARMS REGULATIONS.**—The term "International Traffic in Arms Regulations" means those regulations contained in sections 120 through 130 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(10) **ITEM.**—The term "item" means any good or technology, defense article or defense service subject to the export jurisdiction of the United States under law or regulation.

(11) **LICENSE.**—The term "license" means an official written document of the United States Government issued pursuant to the Export Administration Regulations or the International Traffic in Arms Regulations, as the case may be, authorizing a specific export.

(12) **OTHER FORMS OF APPROVAL.**—The term "other forms of approval" includes any authorization, rule or exemption contained in any statute or regulation that permits an export without a license.

(13) **OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL.**—The term "ownership or control" has the meaning given the term in section 122.2(c) of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations.

(14) **PERSON.**—The term "person" has the meaning given the term in section 38(g)(9)(E) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(g)(9)(E)).

(15) **TECHNOLOGY.**—The term "technology" has the meaning given the term in section 16(4) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415(4)).

(16) **UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.**—The term "United States Munitions List" means

the list referred to in section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3100, a bill which I introduced for the purpose of authorizing measures to deter arms transfers by foreign countries to the People's Republic of China.

□ 1200

This bill has 14 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on International Relations; and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. The Committee on International Relations has marked up the bill and ordered it reported unanimously. The background and need for this legislation can be briefly summarized.

When the House passed Resolution 57 overwhelmingly 411 to 3 on February 2, 2005, it did so in the context of a rising chorus from European leaders that it was time to terminate the European Union's arms embargo on China. In response to this development, Resolution 57 called on the European Union to take two steps: one, to maintain its arms embargo on the People's Republic of China; and, two, to eliminate weaknesses in the embargo and in the national policies of the EU member states. Indeed, those weaknesses are loopholes of one form or another that had permitted European weapons technology to flow to China at an increasingly higher level, even while the embargo remained in place.

Now we have word that the EU has decided for the time being not to terminate the China arms embargo. This, of course, is a welcome development, but it only responds to one of the two steps we asked to be taken. Unfortunately, while maintaining the embargo in the formal sense, the EU and its member states have remained silent on whether they will actually stop the flow of arms-related technology from Europe to China. The supply of European arms technology to China has risen steadily in recent years, both in quantity and quality or sophistication.

With respect to quantity, European arms sales to China increased eight-

fold, to \$540 million in the 3-year period between 2001 and 2003. Qualitatively, European transfers have included a number of systems which increased the range, reliability, and lethality of China's attack aircraft and other offensive weapons systems.

The implications of these transfers are uniformly negative for the security of U.S. Armed Forces in East Asia, for the defense of our friends and allies in the region, and for regional stability more broadly. In this respect, I note the public testimony by the Director of the CIA, Mr. Goss, on February 16, 2005, before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. At that time he pointed out that Beijing's military modernization and military buildup is tilting the balance of power in the Taiwan Strait and that improved Chinese capabilities threaten U.S. forces in the region.

H.R. 3100 would address these continuing serious concerns in several ways. First, the bill would ensure Congress has the information it needs from the executive branch concerning foreign support for Chinese weapons acquisitions. Under H.R. 3100, the President would henceforth submit an annual report to Congress on European companies that are aiding China's military buildup and on European governments whose policies condone these sales.

Second, for those European companies and governments that continue dangerous arms relationships with China, the bill would expand U.S. export license requirements and increase congressional oversight in certain circumstances. This will ensure that access to sensible U.S. weapons technology is monitored carefully in the case of foreign companies that are also suppliers to Chinese military programs. As the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services noted during our April 14 hearing, the technology control plans which govern access to our weapons technology by foreign contractors who are also aiding the Chinese could be very challenging, if not "mission impossible."

Third, the President would be given new authority to help deter future European arms-related sales, should enhanced procedural safeguards not be enough. H.R. 3100 provides a menu of measures the President could draw upon in limiting access of culpable persons to U.S. weapons technology.

Significantly, H.R. 3100 would not have a retroactive character. It will not reach back. This is because the bill is not intended to be punitive; its primary purpose is deterrence. In this context, the optimal report Congress could receive is one in which no European company or government is named. However, if EU member states do not make it possible for this to happen, the President would be in a position to take other steps in consultation with the Congress to safeguard our security interests.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 3100.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3100, the East Asia Security Act of 2005.

Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of American troops are currently deployed in Asia, and the American Armed Forces one day could be sent to the Taiwan Strait to help defend the island nation from invasion by Mainland China. It is also possible that American troops might be mobilized in other circumstances in East Asia.

We certainly do not seek a military confrontation with China. Our country is actively working to reduce the possibility of any hostilities with that country. At the same time, I am certain that my colleagues remember our tense confrontation with China over the incident involving an American EP-3 aircraft that was forced to land at Hainan Island in southern China after it was harassed and damaged by a Chinese fighter aircraft.

In addition to our own troops' safety, Mr. Speaker, our country has other vital interests throughout the Asia Pacific region, including the national and economic security interests of our friends and allies.

Earlier this year, we faced a serious problem when the European Union announced its ill-advised intention to lift the embargo against the sale of sophisticated weapons to China. For the American people, this raised the threat that American soldiers could face the latest in high-tech weaponry manufactured in Europe as well as Chinese weapons systems that could be greatly improved by European technology. In February of this year, this House adopted House Resolution 57, introduced by my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and myself. That resolution called upon the Europeans to maintain their embargo on arms sales to China; and as my colleagues recall, Mr. Speaker, the Hyde-Lantos resolution was adopted in the House by a vote of 411 to 3.

Our European allies received that clear message, and their ill-advised effort to lift the embargo was quietly dropped. I welcomed that action by the European Union.

The embargo on arms sales was initially initiated because of China's horrendous human rights record. Nothing about that record has changed in the 16 years since the Tiananmen Square Massacre. The only difference is China's dramatically increasing military strength and the consequent threat to the entire region.

Even with the embargo still in place, Mr. Speaker, several of the leading nations of Europe have dramatically increased their sales to China of military-related goods and high technology. In 2003, the last year for which data is available, these sales amounted to over a half a billion dollars from

some European Union countries, including France, Germany, Italy, and the Czech Republic. Other non-European Union countries have also sold significant military equipment to China which represents a threat to regional stability.

For all of these reasons, it is important that we make clear our opposition to the sale of sophisticated military equipment to China, and that we establish penalties by law against those companies and countries that engage in sales that are damaging to our own national security interests and the security of East Asia.

Our legislation, the Hyde-Lantos legislation, H.R. 3100, covers any nation whose policies permit the export of dangerous military materiel and technology to China. At the President's discretion, he can publicize the activities of any country that is transferring sensitive goods and technology to the People's Republic of China, and he has the authority to impose sanctions if he chooses.

For any country that is involved in sensitive defense research and development projects with the United States, and whose practices have the potential to allow the transfer of U.S. technology to the People's Republic of China, the Hyde-Lantos bill would require that all U.S. exports of goods and technology to these countries be carefully reviewed and licensed prior to export.

Our bill is extremely important to persuade other countries that there will be severe consequences if they fail to respect the security interests of their most important ally, the United States of America.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I enclose two letters relating to the consideration of H.R. 3100 The East Asia Security Act."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,

Washington, DC, July 12, 2005.

Hon. BILL THOMAS,

Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 3100 "The East Asia Security Act of 2005". The Committee has marked up the bill and ordered it reported by a unanimous vote.

Under Rule X of the House Rules the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over matters concerning imports. One provision under Section 7 of H.R. 3100 may suspend the President's ability to use a license exemption or expedited procedure for licensing of the temporary importation of defense articles, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In the interest of permitting this Committee to proceed expeditiously to the floor consideration of this bill, I request your Committee waive its right to sequential referral on this matter. I understand that such a waiver only applies to this language in this bill, and not to the underlying subject matter. I will urge the Speaker to name Members of your Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider this bill.



I appreciate your willingness to allow us to proceed. I will insert this exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during the debate of this bill.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 2005.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,  
*Chairman, Committee on International Relations, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: I am writing concerning H.R. 3100, the "East Asia Security Act of 2005," which is scheduled for floor consideration on Wednesday, July 13, 2005.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over matters concerning imports. One provision under Section 7 of H.R. 3100 may suspend the President's ability to use a license exemption or expedited procedure for licensing of the temporary importation of defense articles, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3100, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,  
*Chairman.*

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3100.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### COMMEMORATING 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONCLUSION OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC AND HONORING VETERANS OF BOTH PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC THEATERS OF SECOND WORLD WAR

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) commemorating the 60th anniversary of the conclusion of the War in the Pacific and honoring veterans of both the Pacific and Atlantic theaters of the Second World War, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 191

Whereas on December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States was suddenly and deliberately attacked at Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, resulting in the loss of over 2,400 American lives, the greatest such loss of life in a single attack before September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States joined with allies from 32 countries to fight the common foe of fascist militarism in a war in which over 16,000,000 Americans served in the military;

Whereas the United States suffered over 670,000 casualties, with more than 400,000 deaths, while over 105,000 Americans were held as prisoners of war, many of whom were forced to participate in the infamous Bataan Death March or were forced to work on the construction of the Siam-Burma Railway;

Whereas two former Presidents, John F. Kennedy and George H. W. Bush, served with particular distinction and valor in the Pacific theater during the Second World War;

Whereas the sea battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, Leyte Gulf—the greatest naval battle in history—and Lingayen Gulf turned the tide of the war in the Pacific and led to ultimate victory;

Whereas the Sullivan family of Waterloo, Iowa, who lost five sons in a single morning when the USS Juneau was sunk in the Battle of Guadalcanal, came to symbolize for the United States the grief felt by American families over the loss of loved ones during the Second World War;

Whereas on May 14, 1943, the Australian hospital ship Centaur, in transit to New Guinea to pick up the wounded, was sunk fifty miles East-Northeast of Brisbane, Australia, resulting in 268 dead, representing the highest number of casualties of any merchant vessel sunk by a submarine in the Pacific theater;

Whereas General Douglas MacArthur fulfilled his promise of "I shall return" to the Philippine people by leading the successful campaign for the liberation of the Philippines, part of a wider campaign which freed much of Asia from militarist occupation;

Whereas more than 20,000 Japanese and 7,000 Americans died in the battle of Iwo Jima, which raged on the small island of Iwo Jima for over one month between February and March 1945, the fierceness of which was captured in the historic photo of five Marines and one Navy corpsman raising the American flag on Mount Suribachi;

Whereas the Battle of Okinawa, waged between April and June 1945, was the largest sea-land-air battle in history, with more than 38,000 Americans wounded and 12,000 killed or missing, more than 107,000 Japanese and Okinawan conscripts killed, and perhaps 100,000 Okinawan civilians who perished in the Battle;

Whereas millions of people died in Hawaii, Guam, the Coral Sea, Midway, the Marshall Islands, the Solomon Islands, Wake Island, Guadalcanal, Nanjing, Harbin, Beijing, Shanghai, Chongqing, Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaya, Indonesia, Burma, Bataan, Corregidor, Manila, Luzon, Leyte Gulf, Lingayen Gulf, New Guinea, Korea, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Tokyo, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki;

Whereas the Second World War led to dramatic social changes in the United States as more than 19,500,000 women joined the American workforce at defense plants and 350,000 women joined the Armed Forces;

Whereas the roles of minorities in both the Armed Forces and industry were changed forever as greater opportunities for employment and service in the defense of the United States presented themselves;

Whereas Japanese-Americans, including Senator Daniel Inouye, served with courage and valor in the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, the most decorated regiment in United States military history;

Whereas the people of the United States and Japan worked together after the Second World War to reconstruct Japan and to ensure the post-War emergence of Japan as a beacon of democracy and economic liberalization in the Asia-Pacific region, and the United States and Japan further solidified the post-War security relationship by signing the Security Treaty of 1951 and the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security in 1960;

Whereas the sacrifices in the Pacific of United States veterans and veterans of United States allies during the Second World War led to the emergence of an Asian region where democratic institutions and free market economies have taken hold, contributing greatly to the peace and prosperity of the region; and

Whereas on May 29, 2004, the United States gratefully dedicated the World War II Memorial, honoring both the Pacific and Atlantic theaters, on the National Mall in Washington, D.C., with decorated World War II hero Senator Robert Dole giving the dedication speech: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—*

(1) honors all veterans, living and deceased, of the Second World War in both the Pacific and Atlantic theaters on the 60th anniversary year of the War's conclusion and expresses the deep appreciation and gratitude of the United States for their valor and selfless service to their country;

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the final surrender of the Second World War aboard the USS Missouri as a day of remembrance and appreciation for the members of the greatest generation who, through their sacrifices both in the Armed Forces and on the homefront, preserved liberty for future generations and rescued the world from the scourge of fascist militarism;

(3) reaffirms the judgment in Tokyo rendered by the International Military Tribunal for the Far East of 1946–1948 and the conviction of certain individuals as war criminals for their crimes against humanity; and

(4) recognizes that the alliances formed in the Asia-Pacific region following the Second World War, including those with Australia, Japan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, and Thailand, have contributed immeasurably to the continued peace and prosperity enjoyed throughout the region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 191.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 60th anniversary of the final victory in one of the



greatest campaigns for the preservation of freedom in the history of the world. The heroic struggle of America's Greatest Generation and the peoples of the allied countries to defeat the scourge of Fascist militarism and liberate millions from its iron fist was the most monumental endeavor of the entire 20th century.

□ 1215

World leaders quite properly gathered in Moscow on May 9 to commemorate V-E Day, the 60th anniversary of the victory in Europe. We certainly join in honoring our heroic veterans of the D-Day landing and those of the entire Atlantic theater for their valiant efforts to liberate the people of Continental Europe, especially those trapped in death camps from Nazi tyranny.

We should well remember, however, that for the American people, the Second World War neither began nor ended in Europe. For our Nation, the war began on a quiet Sunday morning in Hawaii, when the U.S. was suddenly and deliberately attacked at Pearl Harbor. Over 2,400 lives were lost, including those buried in the sunken hull of the battleship USS *Arizona*. These dead represent the greatest number of American casualties in any such attack prior to September 11, 2001, another date which will live in infamy.

The war for America did not end on May 19 with the defeat of the axis powers in Europe. The battle for Okinawa, the largest sea-land air battle in history was largely fought after the surrender in Europe. It was not until General Douglas MacArthur crossed the deck of the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay to accept the final surrender of Japan on September 2, 1945, that America and the world were finally at peace.

V-E Day had been the beginning of the end, but V-J Day was the final victory. I stand in strong support, therefore, for this concurrent resolution, which gives equal recognition to veterans of both the Pacific and Atlantic theatres as inscribed in the World War II Memorial which was dedicated last year on our National Mall.

This resolution calls upon generations of Americans who followed those who fought and died in this historic conflict to pause and give remembrance to the sacrifices of the greatest generation as the 60th anniversary of V-J Day approaches. The events of that war are slowly fading, and a distant memory, rekindled only in our national consciousness by readings in history textbooks or by clips from old war films, therefore we must assure, through commemorations like the one contained in this resolution that the sacrifices of the World War II generation are never diminished or never forgotten.

We here today should dedicate ourselves to preserving these memories, even as we stand once again to thank our World War II veterans for their sacrifice and their valor. As Americans re-

flect on the decades of unparalleled stability and prosperity following the aftermath of the Second World War, they may recall the words of the great British Scientist, Sir Isaac Newton who said, "If I have been able to see further, it was only because I stood on the shoulders of giants."

The blessings we enjoy today come from standing on the shoulders of those giants who fought, bled and died 6 decades ago so we might be free. And so to all those who fought, we owe an enormous debt of gratitude. Their legacy today is a peaceful and increasingly prosperous Asian Pacific region, where democratic institutions have taken root and market economies have flourished.

Their gift to us is an America which still stands as a beacon of liberty to the people of Asia who remember well the horrors inflicted by the coming of the Second World War.

With pride and boundless gratitude do we acknowledge the unpayable debt we all owe to veterans, who together with our allies and those on the home front, won the final victory which we commemorate today.

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in strong support of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in the context of this commemoration of what happened on the watery battlefields of the Pacific 60 years ago, I want to draw special attention to the actions of one of our most esteemed colleagues in this body, an esteem that is bound to grow once people know and understand the extent of his contributions to the allies' success in this crucial part of World War II.

Our distinguished colleague and my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), now the respected chairman of the House International Relations Committee, back then was a young Naval officer facing the most important battle of his life.

On January 9, 1945, he piloted a landing craft into the Lingayen Gulf as part of a massive landing force hoping to establish a beachhead on the Philippine island of Luzon. His mission was to help liberate the people of the Philippines from Japanese control.

The liberation of the Philippines and the eventual victory of allied forces in the War in the Pacific now seems to have been predetermined. Yet it was anything but decided during this important moment in global history.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) survived the battle of Lingayen Gulf. For his exemplary service to his Nation, he was awarded the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the American Campaign Medal, and the Philippines Liberation Medal.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident to those of us who have had the privilege of working alongside him in the intervening years, that the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. HYDE's) tenacity in battle extends to other forms of conflict.

But it is also clear that he is committed to bipartisan cooperation in the national interest whenever possible. He has remained loyal to the values that propelled him into public service.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect and admiration for the sacrifices of American soldiers, many of whom gave their lives in this epic battle against the forces of fascism and Japanese militarism. I owe my very life to the American military and to the troops of other allied countries which liberated Europe at enormous costs.

There are millions of citizens in the Asia-Pacific region, from the Philippines to Korea, who also owe their freedom to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the thousands of other brave Americans.

In many ways, Mr. Speaker, the victory over Japan was more of a beginning than an end. In the aftermath of World War II, the United States developed strong alliances across the Asia-Pacific region, which have only strengthened for the past 5 decades. The United States and Japan have developed a robust multifaceted relationship based on shared democratic values and mutual interests in Asian and global stability and development.

The strength of our relationship with Japan today and the relative peace of the Asia-Pacific region for over 50 years demonstrate the value of the sacrifices made by the brave American soldiers in the Pacific theater.

With the passage of our resolution, we commemorate these enormous contributions to peace, and we commit ourselves to remembering for all time those who made the ultimate sacrifice for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has been incredibly generous in his remarks, and I would like to comment on his history for the edification of our colleagues.

Hitler's forces occupied Hungary on March 19, 1944. Along with the Nazi invaders came the notorious Adolf Eichmann, with orders to exterminate the Jewish population of Hungary. A 16-year-old boy viewing these somber events decided he had to take a stand. He joined the Hungarian underground, a loose-knit group which was made up of small clusters of individuals.

Sent to a work camp to perform forced labor to maintain a railway bridge, this boy was the sole survivor of an allied bombing raid. "I was convinced I would not survive," the boy recalled. But fate had greater things in store for this young hero. Escaping from the camp, the young man made his way to Budapest where he joined Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg in his rescue operation to save much of the Jewish community of Hungary.

The young man ran operations for the underground carrying food and medicine through Nazi lines to Jews hiding throughout the city. After the war, the young man was reunited with his childhood friend, who was to become his wife, Annette. Together they immigrated to America to start a new life.

Fortunately for all of us on the International Relations Committee and in Congress and in America, that brave lad from Budapest is here with us today. After a distinguished academic career in California, the same determination which kept him alive at the bombed out railway bridge has now brought him to Congress, where he serves as the ranking Democratic member of the International Relations Committee.

For his courage in war, for his service in peace, especially here in Congress, I would like to express sincere and profound appreciation to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS.)

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my friend, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), I just want to express my most profound gratitude to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me the time and giving me the opportunity to speak on the floor today on this issue.

December 7, 1941 would come to mark a historical pivot point for both America and the world. Two days later, the Chamorros people of Guam would also begin a dark and somber time. Over the next 31 months, residents were turned into refugees. Men, women, and children were massacred, an entire island enslaved.

An estimated 700 Chamorro people perished over these years of occupation. On July 21, 1944, American troops once again touched the shores of Guam, ending the oppressive occupation.

□ 1230

Liberation meant a restoration of faith and future to the Chamorros as they sought to reconstruct their island and their lives. The scars of battle still resonate, yet the lingering message of history will never fade 61 years later.

I stand to honor those who fought to liberate our people and to honor the resiliency displayed by the Chamorro people in such formidable times. Just yesterday we went to Arlington to lay a wreath to honor those who perished. And tonight in the Cannon Caucus Room we invite the entire membership of the U.S. Congress and their staff and friends to come and join us in a liberation celebration beginning at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 191.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN LONDON, ENGLAND ON JULY 7, 2005

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 356) condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in London, England, on July 7, 2005.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 356

Whereas, on July 7, 2005, a series of explosions on public transportation facilities in London, England, resulted in the death of scores of civilians and the injury of hundreds of others;

Whereas the explosions had been planned and carried out by terrorists;

Whereas British first responders reacted swiftly and heroically to save and assist civilian victims;

Whereas the people of London and of the United Kingdom have a history of bravery and resolve in the face of terrorism and war;

Whereas the people and Government of the United Kingdom have been engaged in common efforts with the people and Government of the United States in every front in the Global War on Terrorism and in other efforts to assure a safer and more secure world;

Whereas the people and Government of the United Kingdom have been making heroic sacrifices in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and in the ongoing "shadow war" against terrorists around the world; and

Whereas President George W. Bush, then present in Gleneagles, Scotland, with other world leaders, expressed the solidarity of the people and Government of the United States with the people and Government of the United Kingdom: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in London, England, on July 7, 2005;

(2) expresses its condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed in the attacks and expresses its sympathies to those individuals who have been injured;

(3) joins with President George W. Bush in expressing the solidarity of the people and Government of the United States with the people and Government of the United Kingdom as the recovery continues from these cowardly and inhuman attacks; and

(4) expresses its readiness to provide any necessary assistance to the United Kingdom authorities and to devote the necessary resources to bring to justice those individuals responsible for the London attacks, and to pursue, disrupt, undermine, and dismantle the networks which plan and carry out such attacks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 356.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Americans were shocked and dismayed but not necessarily surprised when terror struck at the heart of the capital of the United Kingdom, the cradle of Western liberty, on July 7, 2005.

It is too easy while we are preoccupied with celebrating our independence from Britain in early July to lose sight of what we owe Britain, our language and our culture, the notion of the rule of law and the separation of powers, our common law legal system, and the underpinnings of our economic system, to name a few examples.

The British have been at our side and we at theirs in the struggles against tyranny that preoccupied us throughout most of the 20th century and now in the struggle against the nihilistic terror that has marked the 21st century and in our efforts to bring freedom to Iraq.

So it came as no real surprise to find that those who hate us hate the British too and acted on that hate.

The British have always impressed the world with their courage, their resiliency, recalling the days of the blitz.

Today, Britain is different than the Britain of the Second World War. Its streets are filled with people from all over the world who are making their homes in what is like ours, a land of opportunity where newcomers are integrated into society with remarkable success. Today's Londoners showed themselves to be just as brave and determined as the Londoners of the past.

President Bush made us all proud when he so forthrightly and eloquently supported Prime Minister Blair and pledged his people and government our full support. Today with this resolution, our House adds its voice to his.

We and the British people are bound by ties that terror cannot loosen or fray. We will not be satisfied until we have done what we as Americans can to bring the perpetrators of this attack to

justice and we have successfully pursued, disrupted, undermined, and dismantled on a worldwide basis the networks that carry out such attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 356. Mr. Speaker, once again the backbone, resilience and resistance to barbarity shown by the citizens of Great Britain have inspired men and women everywhere who love liberty and know that it comes with a price. The aftermath of last week's horrendous events in London and memories of an earlier generation's response to the German blitz bring clearly to mind a quality we Americans have long admired about our British cousins: the unwavering will to withstand a setback and then to get on with it.

By their words and by their deeds in the past week, the people of the United Kingdom have demonstrated yet again that they will not allow brutality to intimidate them. Far from it. They and we shall prevail.

Queen Elizabeth, II, who as a teenager helped rally her country to repel tyranny during World War II, was eloquent but emphatic on this point a few days ago as she visited the wounded in a London hospital. "Those who perpetrate these brutal acts against innocent people should know that they will not change our way of life. Atrocities such as these simply reinforce our sense of community, our humanity, and our trust in the rule of law. That is the clear message from all of us."

Mr. Speaker, while the Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw may have been correct when he observed that "England and America are two countries divided by a common language," today there is no sentiment more closely shared by Americans and Britons, nor one so clearly stated, as what Her Majesty said: the perpetrators of this revolting attack "will not change our way of life." Their deeds "simply reinforce our sense of community, our humanity, and," despite the all-too-human impulse to exact swift retribution, "our trust in the rule of law."

Mr. Speaker, our resolution on the events in London now before the House expresses outrage, fortitude and the readiness to provide whatever resources are needed to bring those responsible to justice. On behalf of all our constituents, and all our compatriots, we in the Congress of the United States extend across the Atlantic our deepest condolences and our outstretched hand in solidarity.

On September 12, 2001, Prime Minister Tony Blair called the dark events of the day before "an attack on the free and democratic world everywhere." What happened in London on July 7, 2005, was just such an assault. For the sake of democracy and freedom, it cannot and it will not go unanswered.

Coming as it did on the heels of an exalted week for Britain with the eyes

of the world turned first on Wimbledon, then on the G-8 meeting at Gleneagles and finally on the triumph of being entrusted with the Olympic Games of 2012, this sickening blow may have seemed all the more horrific by contrast with those previous days.

Mr. Speaker, let our response to this outrage be neither to recoil nor to lash out, but to renew our determination to eradicate terrorism so that never again can it cast its insidious shadow over our peaceful lives.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation, I rise in strong support of this resolution that condemns the heinous acts of terrorism that occurred in London last Thursday July 7.

At 8:50 a.m. in a coordinated attack, three bombs ripped through the London Underground in central London and an hour later a fourth explosion tore apart the No. 30 bus. At present, 52 are dead and hundreds and hundreds are wounded. Authorities are still attempting to recover bodies trapped under subway cars deep under Kings Cross station. As a police official gruesomely described this morning, "they have to literally piece people together and that takes time."

The latest news reports suggest that four young British citizens carried out this latest act of Islamist terror, blowing themselves up along with their innocent victims in what would be the first suicide attacks in Western Europe. I fear we are seeing the emergence of a new generation of terrorists, kids who were in their teens on 9/11.

One of the four implicated in the London bombings was a teen. The homegrown cell involved in the Van Gogh murder in the Netherlands included members as young as 18. North African extremists from France have been found in Iraq, some as young as 14. And as the 9/11 Commission described, "Our enemy is two-fold, al Qaeda, a stateless network of terrorists that struck us on 9/11 and a radical ideological movement in the Islamic world inspired in part by al Qaeda which has spawned terrorist groups and violence across the globe."

As the 9/11 Commission tells us, "The first enemy is weakened but continues to pose a grave threat. The second enemy is gathering and will menace Americans and American interests long after Osama bin Laden and his cohorts have been killed or captured. Thus, our strategy must match our means to two ends: dismantling the al Qaeda network and prevailing in the longer term over the ideology that gives rise to Islamist terrorism."

Now, unfortunately, lax asylum laws and lax immigration laws have done

the British and the rest of Europe no favors and have contributed to the radicalization of society there. Long before bombs ripped through London, Britain had become a breeding ground for hate fed by a militant version of Islam. For a decade, the city has been a crossroads for would-be terrorists who used it as a home base to communicate their message, to raise funds and to recruit members.

□ 1245

For years before his arrest, Abu Hamza al-Masri openly preached violence at the Finsbury Park mosque in north London. Among those who have passed through that Finsbury Park mosque are Zacarias Moussaoui and Richard Reid.

Unfortunately, radical clerics gaining a foothold in traditionally tolerant societies is not unique to Britain. The reality is that hate and intolerance is being preached throughout the world, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for bringing this resolution to the floor.

As the British have stood with us, we stand by them. We will prevail. The terrorists will not.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

(Mr. FOSSELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for bringing the resolution to the floor, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and I urge its unanimous adoption.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, the United States was attacked, and Britain stood with us. This was not only an attack against America, but against the civilized world; and Britain understood this.

On July 7, 2005, the terrorists struck again, this time at our ally, Britain, in London. Over 50 people are believed dead and more than 700 wounded in these horrific attacks. These terrorist attacks have once again been directed towards innocent civilians, except that instead of New York and Washington, D.C., the targets were in London. We have seen this deliberate targeting of civilians by terrorists in other places, like Bali, Istanbul, Madrid, and beyond.

This message really goes to the people of Britain, the citizens of London, but especially to the families who lost loved ones last week. In 2001, when not just the United States of America came together but the rest of the global world stood with the United States and the families who lost loved ones on 2001, it was a show of appreciation, respect, sympathy, and condolences for those who lost their lives to terror.

Out of the pain and the sorrow for many of those families, and I know this

because I represent about 300 who lost loved ones on that fateful day on September 11, one of the saving graces from all of that was the outpouring of support from around the world that let them know that they did not stand alone; that let them know that our allies, whether Great Britain or beyond, stood with them and that the best days, hopefully, would come.

Today, we stand as a body, as elected representatives, but really speaking for those people we represent to send those same sympathies and condolences to the people of London.

Yes, we will prevail. Yes, this web of terror, and if there is not a point in time we can say, it let now be the time, this web of terror must be destroyed, whether it is Bali, or the World Trade Center, or the Khobar Towers, or Nairobi, or Jakarta, or any other place around the world where innocent people still must fear for their lives because of these radical terrorists who think nothing of taking innocent lives, including their own.

The people of London have now been Exhibit A in the latest chapter in the war against terror. But the free people of the United States, the free people of Great Britain, and the free people around the world, with our brave men and women in the United States Armed Services and those who are willing to step up and give their life, will prevail against these rogue terrorist punks.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing forth this resolution today.

All of us here know how the Brits felt last Thursday morning. We had all been there ourselves in our own morning of terror not that long ago. It was a routine morning commute, just a regular ordinary day; and then the course of hundreds of lives changed and thousands of others were deeply affected. And we saw the best of the people of London: people shocked but calm, bravely helping others, a city getting up and getting back to work on Friday morning, and determined leaders who will not bow to terrorists.

There were two things that came to my mind, and more than one person has recalled the leadership of Winston Churchill not that long ago. While his admonishment to "never give in" is more well-known, there is another speech he gave in the summer of 1941, after London had endured months of bombing and 20,000 casualties in the fall and winter of 1940-41. He said: "But there was one thing about which there was never any doubt. The courage, unconquerable grit and stamina of the Londoners showed itself from the very outset. Without that all would have failed. Upon that rock, all stood unshakable."

Upon that rock, they are still unshakable. Our thoughts and prayers are with the people of London.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to reemphasize our united determination to stand with the people of the United Kingdom in their moment of sorrow and anguish and to reiterate our determination not to rest until terrorism is destroyed on the face of this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, even today, as our friends and allies in London and the United Kingdom move forward with heavy hearts and continued anxiety, they are striking back at the barbaric and cowardly terrorists who attacked them without warning last week.

The British people have seen the face of evil and, as we knew they would, they have remained steadfast, resolute, and unbowed.

They have no intention of altering their way of life, or compromising the democratic principles that have fortified them through the centuries.

All of us can learn from their strong, courageous example, as we extend our deepest condolences to the loved ones and friends of those who have been stolen by these heinous murderers.

It is incumbent upon us not only to condemn the perpetrators and supporters of these unconscionable attacks, but also to express the unwavering solidarity of the American people and our government with the people and government of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, the civilized world is under attack today by the purveyors of hate, violence, intolerance and lawlessness. They have no compunction about attacking and killing innocent men, women and children.

And our responsibility to this and future generations could not be more clear. We must expose the moral emptiness and political hopelessness of those who subscribe to this twisted ideology—this jihadist death cult—and we must extinguish this force of darkness and despair.

Victory in this fight will not be easy, but it is inevitable as long as all those who cherish peace, tolerance and the rule of law stand together as one.

Sixty-five years ago, Winston Churchill, in steeling the British people against the terror of his day—Hitler's Nazi regime—said: "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be; for without victory there is no survival."

We must summon the same courage and conviction today. Our enemies seek our destruction, but they underestimate our will. But we shall succeed. Victory will be ours. And, when we look back upon these difficult days, we will be reminded of the British people's courage and steadfast determination.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 356.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2864, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2005

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 346 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 346

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2864) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except

one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 346 is a structured rule that allows for debate on H.R. 2864, the Water Resources Development Act of 2005. The rule makes in order seven amendments to the bill, five offered by Democrats, one offered by a Republican, and one bipartisan amendment.

The underlying bill is a solidly bipartisan piece of legislation introduced by the chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment.

I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG); the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN); and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for working together to produce an outstanding piece of legislation.

The Water Resources Development Act renews the commitment of this Congress to dealing with our Nation's water infrastructure. From clean drinking water and wastewater treatment to transportation on our rivers, it is crucial to invest in our water infrastructure.

H.R. 2864 authorizes or modifies 102 projects and studies related to navigation, improving our country's ability to ship goods and improve our economy.

The bill includes 225 flood disaster reduction projects and studies. West Virginia, my home State, has been hit by several devastating floods in the past few years. I appreciate that this bill includes authorization for a watershed drainage assessment of the lower Kanawha River Basin in Kanawha, Putnam, Mason, Jackson, and Roane counties in my district.

H.R. 2864 also reauthorizes important corps projects across the country to bring water and sewer lines to rural communities. These water and sewer projects bring jobs and economic development to areas that need business investment. This legislation is a jobs bill because it provides for the infrastructure needs of our communities and allows for better movement of goods across our waterways.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported the Water Resources Development Act in a bipar-

tisan manner, and I trust that the full House will adopt the bill today in the same manner. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from West Virginia for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and strongly support the underlying measure, H.R. 2864, that would provide for the water infrastructure needs of our Nation.

The Water Resources Development Act before us today reflects a shared commitment to the larger goal of developing our national water resources to address economic, environmental, and also public safety needs.

H.R. 2864 is a comprehensive bill. It does more than just authorize nearly \$10 billion for the construction of nearly 700 water resource development projects and studies by the Army Corps of Engineers. It seeks to improve the corps' implementation of projects.

From working with the corps year after year, we know there are better ways to implement projects. This bill includes provisions to ensure that corps projects are managed in a coordinated and efficient manner, with improved financial management.

To improve the planning and execution of ongoing projects, the committee is asking that the corps submit yearly financial reports, including anticipated spending needs for future years.

□ 1300

The measure also streamlines the project review process for environmental reports and analyses.

Further, it would also allow for better coordination between the Federal review and State agencies affected by the project. And these are just a few examples of the many provisions this bill includes to encourage better management and coordination of U.S. Army Corps projects. These improvements are common sense. They will not only facilitate better economic and environmental benefits of the projects, but they will also allow projects to reach completion faster.

With a number of ongoing water projects in my district of Sacramento, California, these provisions will translate into real and tangible results. Sacramento has a long history intertwined with floods.

When the city endured a near catastrophic flood in 1986, the community quickly realized it did not have nearly the level of flood protection necessary to fully safeguard the region. After the city again faced more floods in 1997, the community redoubled its efforts to achieve 200-year flood protection. However, until that day arrives, flooding

remains a very constant and genuine threat. And continued Federal assistance plays an important role in obtaining that goal.

Despite years of effort, Sacramento still remains one of the most flood-prone and threatened cities in the country, pining in comparison to the level of protection enjoyed by other river cities.

Thanks to the leadership of this committee, much has been done to address the flood control needs of the region. Indeed, several project authorizations already in place that, once completed, will provide in excess of 200-year flood protection for much of the area. With the continued support of Congress, Sacramento has already made incremental progress toward our initial goal of achieving 100-year flood protection for the region, and ultimately moving as quickly as possible towards 200-year flood protection.

Fortunately, as a result of lengthy bipartisan negotiations, Congress has authorized a suite of projects that will achieve 200-year flood protection. Upon completion of the authorized projects to improve area levees, modify the outlets of Folsom Dam and raise Folsom Dam by 7 feet, Sacramento will obtain its long-term flood control goal.

I deeply appreciate the years of support of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has provided to ensure these projects continue to move forward, providing Sacramento the level of flood protection that it both needs and deserves.

In this bill, the committee embraced a project which seemed to be bogged down and hopeless, but because of a little bit of innovation and a strong commitment to finding success, it will be authorized today.

After the Corps of Engineers recommended a flood control project at Magpie Creek in Sacramento, the project faced an unavoidable redesign that nearly doubled the total cost of the project. The cost increase put the project out of reach of local affordability, and the project seemed to be stalled indefinitely. Taking the initiative, the local sponsor, the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, developed a revised plan that is not only less costly, but also has less of an environmental impact.

What is significant is the cooperation between the local stakeholders, the Corps and Congress to work together to find a solution. Because of this cooperation, Sacramento now has a more efficient project which will better protect us.

Just as thought went into this project's plan, it is apparent that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee put great deliberation into this bill. I would like to offer my deep gratitude for the hours of work that the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Chairman DUNCAN) and the ranking members, the gentleman from

Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) have put into this bill. Their long negotiations have produced a bill that will save lives, homes and businesses from devastation of floodwaters and improve the quality of life.

These are stakes Sacramento knows well. My district is located at the confluence of the Sacramento and American rivers. Sacramento is the hub of a 6-county regional economy that provides 800,000 jobs for 1.5 million people. A major flood along the American River will cripple this economy, and cost between \$7 billion and \$16 billion in direct property damages and likely result in significant loss of life.

The risk of serious flooding poses an unacceptable threat to the safety and economic well-being of Sacramento and to California's State capitol. It is because of the bipartisan commitment in the Sacramento region and the bipartisan commitment of these committee members that Sacramento is slowly reducing its risk of flooding. We are on a path, and I thank the committee for forging ahead with my community, to bring Sacramento the long-awaited flood protection it needs and deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill, the Water Resources Development Act of 2005, or WRDA.

Our Nation's water resource infrastructure is critical to our economy, transportation system, power generation, flood control, and environmental protection and restoration. This is especially true in my area in the Pacific Northwest.

Our region's river system is a great resource, a resource that must be well-managed and protected. Hydroelectric dams provide clean, low-cost renewable power. These facilities also provide a system of locks that allow for the efficient transport of tons of agricultural products to coastal ports, which reduces congestion on our highways and rail systems. The dams allow for the control of floods, should that be necessary.

The coastal ports that receive the river-barged goods and products also need careful attention. They are the gateways to overseas markets. The success of farmers and manufacturers throughout the Northwest depend upon these ports being navigable and appropriately maintained.

I want to highlight several provisions of this bill that are of importance to the communities and individuals that I represent in central Washington.

Like the WRDA bill passed by the House in the last Congress, this bill includes direction to the Corps of Engineers to allow workers at northwest dams to participate in wage surveys. This is a simple matter of equity as workers' participation in wage survey is afforded to other Federal workers doing similar jobs, especially at other facilities in the northwest. I have worked with the United Power trade organization on this effort, and I am pleased it once again will pass the House.

This bill also includes language that will allow the Corps to officially give credit to the Port of Sunnyside for funding it has invested to maintain progress on its wetland restoration and waste water treatment project. This project is a creative initiative by the Port of Sunnyside to improve the river habitat and provide for greater economic growth in the local community. This provision ensures that the Port of Sunnyside gets proper credit for funds it invests as it works with the Corps to make this project a reality.

Finally, this legislation lifts Corps restrictions on the development of several Port of Pasco properties. I am very hopeful that elimination of these flowage easements will allow beneficial use of this prime riverfront property to move forward to the betterment of Pasco and the Tri-Cities, of which Pasco is one of the three cities.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep our commitment to sustain and enhance our Nation's water resource infrastructure, and that requires a regular review and updating of congressional direction to the Corps of Engineers to ensure that existing projects are maintained and that new needs are met.

This is the purpose of the WRDA bill and why it is important that it pass the House and the Senate act on it this year to ensure that this measure and the benefits it provides will become law.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying WRDA bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy for yielding me this time, and I noticed with pride her reference to the Sacramento situation. We worked with Bob Matsui on that for years, and he provided great leadership. I appreciate the gentlewoman's continued efforts, and I am pleased this bill looks like it may help move that project forward. It is a priority for not only California, but also the Nation.

I am also pleased to serve under the leadership of the gentleman from Tennessee (Chairman DUNCAN). I truly believe that the work of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is developing a path for a new direction for the Corps of Engineers and water resources.

This has been an arduous, difficult task in our Chamber and the other

Body, dealing with a wide variety of issues and I salute him, our ranking member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and her predecessor, Mr. COSTELLO, because I know they have spent long, hard hours bringing forth a product that will do much good for America.

I come today in support, however, of one amendment which I appreciate being made in order in this rule which will enable the Chamber to take a step back and look at the largest, most expensive navigation project in America's history. I think it is important that we take that careful look, because frankly, there are grave questions about this project.

Today, for instance, I note yet another in a flood, if I may use the term, of editorials from around the country. This from the Chicago Tribune entitled "Reality on the River" that calls into question the wisdom of this massive investment.

WRDA would authorize \$1.8 billion to expand seven locks on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. This would be the most expensive project for navigation in our Nation's history. It will take 10 to 15 percent of the Corps construction funding for years, indeed decades.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) needs to be concerned about this if we are going to fund what she wants. The gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) has water resource needs that are of significance to her constituents, which are at risk if we are going to make this massive investment.

For order of magnitude, Members are familiar with the "Big Dig" highway project in Massachusetts. This is an order of magnitude five times larger than the Big Dig when applied to water.

When the Corps is facing a \$58 billion backlog of projects right now and a construction budget of less than \$2 billion per year, we need to look at this very, very carefully; especially since the economic justification of this project is not just shaky, but frankly, it looks to be flawed.

Studies by the National Academy of Science and the Congressional Research Service, as well as the recent history of traffic on the Mississippi, shows that there is not an increase in barge traffic that would justify it. In fact, for the last 20 years, barge traffic has been flat, and for the last 13 years it has declined. It has declined more than a third from 1992. As barge traffic has declined, we have nonetheless spent almost a billion dollars rehabilitating the locks on the river. This has been controversial from the start. This project helped launch our Corps reform efforts. Members of this Chamber may remember in the year 2000, the Corps of Engineers fired the lead economist, Donald Sweeney, because he claimed Corps officials had ordered him to "cook the books," to underestimate how much was going to be shipped.



Well, he applied for whistleblower protection. In fact, the Army's inspector general confirmed that the Corps had manipulated the documents. Unfortunately, the Corps has not adequately fixed the process.

Several studies from the National Academy of Science and the Congressional Research Service show that the model is still flawed. In fact, the most recent study from the National Academy of Science in 2004 points out that despite their efforts, "The study contains flaws serious enough to limit its credibility and value within the policymaking process."

Now, I want to make clear I am not here today to kill this project. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and I are offering an amendment that simply says if this project is justified, then it goes forward. Our amendment just says that the minimum justification, 35 million tons of barge traffic, is the lowest justification that would make this economically viable. They have 3 more years to hit the target. Maybe there has been an aberration in the last 20 years, so they have 3 more years. If in the course of the next 3 years there still is no increase, then certainly we should not be spending almost \$2 billion.

This amendment does not delay the project. Testimony before our committee indicated it will take 4 to 5 years even with optimal funding for planning for this to move forward.

□ 1315

Not only would the amendment not delay the project at all, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and I recommend that there be immediate activities in the basin to be able to move barges more efficiently. Under our amendment, people who ship will get help immediately. It will make it easier for barge traffic to go up and down. It will make it easier to hit their projections. It would seem we are doing them a favor.

Bear in mind that this is a time of great change in the upper Midwest. Their products are going north to Canada on rail, south to Mexico on rail under NAFTA. They are actually exporting less because they are using product for the domestic market for things like ethanol and for food for animals. It is not likely that there is going to be a need for increased river capacity in the future. And it is not about shifting to trucks. This product is already moving on rail, going north and south, going west; and we are not taking away the barges in the Mississippi River. They will still be there.

I strongly urge my friends to look at this, the largest project for navigation in our history, to do things now under our amendment that will help the barge traffic, that are cheaper and more cost effective. Every Member has a stake in this, and I urge your consideration.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 13, 2005]

#### REALITY ON THE RIVER

Congress is poised to approve the most expensive water navigation and restoration project in U.S. history, despite glaring evidence that the project is a multibillion-dollar boondoggle.

The proposed \$1.8 billion project would enlarge and modernize the 80-year-old system of locks along the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers so barges carrying corn, soybeans and other goods to Gulf of Mexico ports can travel more quickly. Advocates say the project is needed for Midwestern agribusiness to stay ahead of rising competitors such as Brazil. The mighty Mississippi remains a cheap shipping route, but congestion and other delays sometime hold up barges for hours.

The 10-year-old project, though, has faced constant questions about wasteful spending and inflated expectations. The Army Corps of Engineers has predicted river traffic could increase as much as 30 percent over the next 20 years. But a Congressional Research Service report and studies by the National Academy of Sciences have found little to back up that rosy projection and have questioned whether the real economic benefits will be worth the cost.

Congress has one chance to protect taxpayers on this. The House is scheduled to vote as early as Wednesday on a measure that would cut off the project's funds before construction begins if river traffic fails to grow as much as the Army Corps projects it will over the next five years. That measure deserves strong support.

There's good reason to question the projections. Mississippi River traffic is close to where it was back in 1980 and has declined sharply through the five major locks since 1990, partly because Midwestern growers have been shipping more goods by rail and selling more corn to nearby ethanol plants.

The locks improvement project ground to a halt in early 2000 after a whistle-blower accused the Army Corps of inflating the project's economic benefits. An investigation by the Army's inspector general later cited a built-in bias at the Corps in favor of costly construction projects.

Yet a coalition of barge operators, agricultural producers and Midwestern lawmakers is pushing the House to approve the project before the August recess.

It may be too late to head off that approval. But an amendment sponsored by Rep. Jeff Flake, an Arizona Republican, and Rep. Earl Blumenauer, an Oregon Democrat, would make the first phase of construction money dependent upon river traffic increasing enough to justify it.

If traffic fails to reach the 16 percent growth that the Army Corps projects by 2010, funds to the expansion project would be denied. Taxpayers would have paid only \$13.7 million, which was approved last year for research and design.

The Army Corps of Engineers has an unfortunate reputation for underestimating costs and exaggerating benefits of some of its projects. Tying its construction budget to its own predictions would create a powerful incentive for the Corps and other government agencies to ground their grand plans in realistic expectations.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from West Virginia for yielding me this time and for her hard work on this bill. I rise in strong

support of the rule for consideration of H.R. 2864, the Water Resources Development Act of 2005. This is a good rule and a good bill. There are, as all of us know, very few amendments; and I think that is in large part because the committee has worked hard over a long period of time to address Members' needs in the bill and in the manager's amendment.

I think that our subcommittee does not have a better member than the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), and I will speak more to his amendment during general debate. But I can tell you that I certainly sympathize with the thrust of his amendment because I think every water project in the country should be looked at very closely and should be done in the most cost-effective way possible. I will say just simply at this point that the project of which he has spoken and to which his amendment is addressed is the number one priority of the Inland Waterway Users Board representing the taxpayers who pay into the inland waterway trust fund and that pays one-half of the project cost. As I said, I will speak in more detail about the general provisions of the bill during general debate.

Right now, let me just say that H.R. 2864 is the product of several years of bipartisan work by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) mentioned the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) who was the ranking member and with whom I worked so closely on this bill in the last Congress.

Basically, this bill in the last Congress is really the product or was the forerunner and is very, very similar to this bill and that bill passed the last Congress by a vote of 412-8. Basically, we have the same bill here today. By working together, the committee is presenting to the House a bill that is supported by over 200 organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which has stated that they plan to score the vote on this bill when they issue their annual "How They Voted" ratings.

I certainly would not want to run through the more than 200 of those groups, but just let me give you a short list of some groups supporting this bill, and you will see some of the wide variety:

the Chamber of Commerce, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, the Associated General Contractors of America, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies, the International Longshoremen's Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Association of Port Authorities, the Laborers International Union, the National Mining Association, the Agricultural Retailers Association, American



Waterways Operators, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the American Shipbuilding Association, the National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association.

I could go and on. But you see that we have business groups supporting this bill, labor groups supporting this bill, governmental organizations supporting this bill; and so I think this is a bill that deserves bipartisan support. It is a very fiscally conservative bill.

But I think perhaps even more importantly, we have passed WRDA bills and water resource development bills usually every 2 years for many years. No WRDA bill in the history of this Congress has done more to be environmentally friendly, none has done more for environmental infrastructure projects, none has gone further in setting up peer review procedures for our major projects; and so I think this is a bill that will receive and will deserve the support of a very large number of Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Rules Committee for their help and assistance and cooperation, and I urge passage of this rule and passage of the underlying bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I encourage Members to support the rule. I look forward to the debate and hopeful passage of the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I urge all of my colleagues to support this fair rule and the bipartisan underlying legislation which provides critical funding to improve our Nation's water infrastructure. From clean drinking water and wastewater treatment to transportation on our rivers, it is crucial to invest in our water infrastructure.

This is a jobs bill that will spur economic growth and development in communities across our Nation. I believe all Members should be able to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1354

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6) to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. CAPPS moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 6 (An Act to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy) be instructed not to agree to the inclusion of any provisions in the conference report modifying the liability with respect to methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this motion would do one thing: it urges conferees to reject a provision granting MTBE manufacturers a waiver from liability for the damage their products have caused to groundwater supplies throughout this country.

This broad liability waiver for MTBE manufacturers should be rejected for a number of reasons.

First, and most recent, a new draft risk assessment on MTBE written by the Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that MTBE is a likely, and I quote "likely," human carcinogen. According to the publication "Inside EPA," the study pinpoints kidney and lymph node tumors as a result of MTBE exposure.

Up until now, most of the concern about MTBE contamination has been that a tiny bit of it makes water smell and taste like kerosene, rendering the water unusable. But now EPA has released information that says MTBE in water may mean more than an unpleasant taste or smell: it may threaten your health.

MTBE contamination is a huge problem, and it is not going away. To date, this contamination has been found in over 2,300 water systems serving 36 States. Two recent studies have reconfirmed that the cost of removing MTBE from drinking water is substantial. The new studies put MTBE cleanup costs in

the range of \$25 billion to \$33 billion and could be as high as \$85 billion or more, and that is the cost for existing pollution.

Third, documents unearthed in court cases show that MTBE manufacturers knew as early as the mid-1980s about the damage their products caused to groundwater sources; and yet they continued to add it to gasoline. That is why juries have found that MTBE is a defective product. They also found that oil companies acted with malice because they knew what could happen with MTBE, and they did not do anything to stop it. That is why these oil companies have settled their cases. They did not pay millions of dollars to Tahoe, Santa Monica, and other communities out of good citizenship. They did it because they knew that juries would lower the boom on them for their actions. That is why this bill voids defective product lawsuits, because that is the way oil companies are being held accountable for their actions.

Fourth, CBO has found that the liability waiver in this House bill is an unfunded mandate. This protection for MTBE manufacturers is a huge unfunded liability that would shift the cost of the cleanup, literally billions of dollars, on to towns, cities, and water districts, on to your constituents, I say to my colleagues; and that is just plain wrong.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, the House narrowly voted down my amendment to strike the MTBE liability waiver from our bill. Many Members voted "no" because of some impending deal to address the cleanup issue once and for all. Well, reports of this deal have leaked out. They are not pretty, and they will not address the MTBE contamination that your constituents face today or may face in the future.

The deal would provide full liability protection to MTBE producers and establish a \$4 billion to \$8 billion trust fund to address the contamination crisis. One big problem: remember, the cleanup of MTBE contamination is going to cost between \$25 billion and \$33 billion and could be as high as \$85 billion, dwarfing this deal's cleanup fund.

Another problem: at least half of this fund comes from taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, why should taxpayers pay to clean up MTBE contamination? MTBE manufacturers caused this problem, and they knew it when they did it. They should clean it up.

This is a deal written by the industry for the industry. And it is no surprise that no one from the water industry, no cities, no counties, the people who will have to deal with the contamination, none of these people support this bill.

Finally, these are the controversial MTBE provisions that killed the energy bill in the last Congress. The Senate bill did not include MTBE provisions in their bill, and for good reason. They knew that giving these manufacturers protection from liability would

end the chances of the bill becoming law. With the country continuing to experience record energy prices, the need for comprehensive energy legislation is clear, and MTBE provisions once again threaten the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the MTBE industry knowingly caused widespread groundwater pollution, and now it is trying to shirk its responsibility to the communities living with this huge problem.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Capps motion to instruct conferees and to reject this ridiculous bailout for the MTBE industry.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise just to say that I object to the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct. I commend the Congresswoman for her extraordinary leadership, for working to protect communities from MTBE and from unfunded mandates that shift of cost of clean-up to communities without the funding to match.

For 5 years, Republicans have pushed policies to give billions of dollars to special interests which then reaped record profits. Republicans are not listening to the American people's concerns about the need for safe drinking water, clean air, or for lowering the price at the pump of gasoline.

Instead of siding with the Americans strangled by high gas prices, President Bush's own Department of Energy said that the energy bill would actually raise gas prices, and that the President's proposals would increase our foreign oil dependence by 85 percent.

But nowhere is Republican pandering more on display than in the provisions relating to MTBE. Mr. Speaker, as you probably know, a few drops of MTBE can poison whole drinking water supplies. The industry knew that MTBE would leak from gasoline storage tanks when they lobbied for its use.

They deliberately hid this fact from Congress. The result of their malfeasance is clear: MTBE contaminated groundwater in every single State in America with estimated clean-up costs between \$25 and \$85 billion.

Incredibly, instead again of siding with communities poisoned by MTBE, House Republicans lined up to protect polluters from liability. Last year, the Majority Leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) added language to the energy bill to protect MTBE polluters knowing it would kill the legislation and he did the same this year.

The House-passed bill protects MTBE producers from lawsuits. By their actions, House Republicans imposed an

unfunded mandate on local communities to protect polluters. This is contrary to a fundamental principle that in our society polluters must pay for the damage they cause, not our children with their health.

The Republicans said to localities, not only will we protect the people who poisoned your water, but we are going to leave you with the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are spending our time debating yet another huge subsidy for profitable oil and gas companies at taxpayer's expense, when we should be focusing on what consumers want, clean water to drink and relief from high prices at the pump.

This is a disgrace. Conferees should insist on the Senate version that excludes this shameful MTBE liability waiver. Only then can we reaffirm our commitment to strengthening community by promoting a clean and healthy environment where polluters pay again for the damage they cause, not our children with their health.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from California, (Mrs. CAPPS) for seizing this opportunity as she did when the House first considered this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to instruct so that we can end this disgraceful giveaway to oil companies and MTBE polluters that poison water all across the country.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Capps motion. The House Energy Bill contains a so-called "Fuels Safe Harbor" that hands over get-out-of-court-free cars to the big oil companies responsible for polluting our communities' drinking water supplies with MTBE. The MTBE safe harbor is really a pirates cove for corporate polluters.

If enacted, it will let corporate polluters off the hook for water contamination and other damages to the environment and public health resulting from MTBE contamination.

A few months ago, President Bush said, "I will tell you, with \$55 oil, we do not need to give incentives to oil and gas companies to explore, there are plenty of incentives."

Well, the President is right. Oil prices are now up to \$60 a barrel, but the Republican energy bill would nonetheless hand billions of dollars worth of tax and regulatory subsidies over to wealthy oil companies. The MTBE liability waiver is only the tip of the vast iceberg of subsidies in this bill. \$8 billion in tax subsidies and incentives for energy companies in the energy bill; \$3 billion for the oil and gas industry; billions more in the Senate bill for the oil and gas industry.

There is something called royalty relief for the oil industry, which basically suspends requirements for oil companies to pay the Government for drilling on public land. There is a \$2 billion subsidy for ultradeep water

drilling R&D, and they also get a special exemption from the Clean Water Act.

With oil prices hovering at \$60 a barrel, they do not need these breaks. Exxon reported \$25 billion worth of profits last year; Conoco, \$8 billion; royal Dutch Shell, \$18 billion; BP, \$16 billion; Chevron-Texaco, \$13 billion. They do not need any incentives from the taxpayer, they are already in the pockets of the very same people as consumers, tipping them upside down.

And just think about it. The oil companies are making more money than they can ever spend, and Congress, in this bill, is going to pass a bill totally immunizing MTBE producers from any legal liability for producing an inherently defective product.

If there is an industry that can pay for this problem, it is the industry that has made more profits in the last year than any industry in the history of the world. We are going to do this despite scientific studies which have shown that MTBE causes cancer in laboratory animals.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a huge mistake, the House "safe harbor" from legal liability will shift the burden of cleaning up MTBE contamination from the companies back to the local community. So again, the consumer will be paying high gasoline prices, high home heating oil prices, they will be paying out of their tax dollars to give subsidies to the oil companies, and then they will have to go into their pockets again to clean up the mess which is left over.

Vote yes for the Capps motion to instruct the conferees.

Ms. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for her leadership, not only on this issue, but on so many others that come before the House Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct. It may indeed be our very last chance to get something right in this flawed energy bill, so-called energy bill. According to the independent analysts at the U.S. Energy Information Administration, this bill has virtually no impact on energy production, on consumption, on imports or on prices at the pump.

In fact, these independent analysts say that gas prices will increase. So wake up, America. Look what is happening to you under a so-called energy bill. The price that you pay at the pump is going to go up. Is that what we need the Congress for? I do not think so.

If the House bill did nothing, that would be one story. But the truth is that the bill imposes huge costs on taxpayers. And that is what we are protesting here on the floor, and why there is this motion to instruct.

Probably the worst provision of the bill is the MTBE liability waiver. What is it? It provides a safe place, a safe

harbor that prevents refiners and MTBE manufacturers from being held accountable in court for selling a defective product. What this safe harbor does is relieve the industry of any obligation to pay even a portion of the estimated \$29 to \$85 billion cost of cleaning up drinking water that has been contaminated by the product.

So who pays? You pay. Not those that are responsible for it, but you. All under the guise of we want to lower your taxes. Imagine what is going to happen in your local community. Do you think your local government has this money? Mine does not.

The Congressional Budget Office calls this an unfunded mandate—you have to do it, but there is no money to do it—on local and State governments, because they have to pay for the cleanups on their own.

This is not just a matter of accounting. It is a matter of public health. Just last week it was reported in a new EPA draft report that MTBE is a likely carcinogen. And when MTBE is found in drinking water, we know we have to clean it up. There is not an option on this. I do not want my kids drinking it. I do not want yours to.

Successful lawsuits in California have led to substantial settlements with oil companies. And these settlements have enabled communities to begin cleaning up their drinking water supplies. Now, because communities are winning these suits, the industry wants Congress to let them off the hook.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to do this. If they are losing in court, it is because they have a lousy case. And there is a reason that these settlements are taking place, the industry is responsible for the mess and they have known about the threat for years.

So why is a safe harbor being created for the industry? No one outside the industry thinks this is a good idea. In May of this year, the Governor of California wrote to us and said that this provision should be stripped from the bill. I think that my California colleagues should be paying attention to that.

Along with the Governor, the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, the Association of California Water Agencies and many others have sent letters voicing their opposition. This is a bad provision.

Last Congress the provision sank the bill. And it should have. This year we should strip it from the bill. Vote for the motion to instruct.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS') motion to instruct energy bill conferees to strike the MTBE liability waiver provision from the final energy bill.

The conferees should understand that we want an energy bill, not an energy subsidy bill. What is more important?

The profits of oil companies or the health of our people and the financial health of States and communities in which we live?

The liability waiver assumes that Congress mandated MTBE use in 1990. But that is really not true. Congress mandated the use of an oxygenate in reformulated gasoline, but MTBE is not and was not the only oxygenate.

MTBE was used extensively in non-RFG areas where no mandate applied. Furthermore, MTBE was marketed and used extensively before 1990. Maine's experience really illustrates the MTBE problem.

Maine volunteered to phase into the Federal reformulated gas program in 1991. And in 1995 reformulated gas containing MTBE entered the marketplace in Maine. Two years later, in 1997, the Maine Bureau of Health reported MTBE in 7 percent of Maine public water supplies.

One year later, 1998, MTBE was detected in 16 percent of the public water supplies. So starting that year, 1998, Maine began phasing out the use of MTBE, and in 2007, Maine will impose a partial ban of MTBE.

□ 1415

This liability waiver creates a massive unfunded mandate. Communities face a 25 to \$85 billion bill to clean up the MTBE. And juries in some cases have recently found the MTBE manufacturers, lax Texas oil firms, were dishonest about the impact of their product on groundwater. The juries concluded that the companies are liable for the cost of cleanup.

One reason is when you go back to 1981, the Shell engineers were joking with each other that MTBE stood for "menace threatening our bountiful environment" or "most things biodegrade easier." They knew what the impact of this substance would be.

Just this month, just this month EPA developed a draft risk analysis that concludes that MTBE is a "likely" human carcinogen. If finalized, this would dramatically increase the cost of MTBE cleanup.

So this liability waiver provision takes away the best claim that communities and States have to require manufacturers to help clean up the mess they created by manufacturing a defective product.

Now, finally, we hear a lot about a deal in the works to address this crisis. I would ask, will this deal protect communities from having to pay to clean up MTBE? Will this deal cover the cost of cleaning up the water, or will it just pay to remove leaking tanks? Will this deal be subject to an annual appropriations at a time when funding for clean water programs here in Congress is being cut, or will it charge cleanup costs to the American people in order to bail out Texas oil companies?

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massa-

chusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Capps motion to instruct.

Though this administration and the Republican majority often stress the need for an energy bill, citing rising gas prices, this bill will not do anything to lower energy prices in this country. Gas prices continue to rise, and this bill does nothing to lower them.

The Republican energy bill does nothing to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil. It harms our environment, and in the end it is nothing more than a big fat giveaway to the oil and gas industries at a time when they do not need these giveaways.

If that were not bad enough, oil companies have knowingly contaminated our Nation's water systems with the fuel additive MTBE, polluting the same drinking water that serves 45 million Americans. These companies were fully aware of MTBE's ability to seep in the water supply, and they understood the impact that this potential human carcinogen could have on public health. Yet they still chose to use MTBE for nearly 20 years. And now the Republican leadership wants to protect these same oil companies from any liability for the damages they have caused.

Instead, they want to leave it up to our State and local governments to pick up the tab. This is unconscionable. This motion to instruct is based on common sense. These companies should be held responsible for the damages they caused.

Now, we all know the arguments. This is an unfunded mandate passed on to our State and local governments. Many communities have filed legitimate suits to recover the costs of MTBE cleanup estimated to exceed \$29 billion. Yet this bill essentially blocks these suits and could preempt hundreds more, leaving communities with a multibillion dollar unfunded mandate at the hands of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the party of States' rights has become the party of Big Business. This bill is another handout to the oil, gas, and MTBE producers. Support the Capps motion to instruct and strike this lousy provision.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the work of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) on this important issue that not only affects California but the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees on the MTBE provision in the House energy bill. I adamantly oppose the language in the House bill passed which would give a free ride to manufacturers of MTBE, leaving taxpayers across the country holding the bag for cleanup. This is not an issue where a deal can be struck.

The industry, the only supporters of these deals, has been spreading false

statements about the cleanup of MTBE being paid for by responsible parties and wants us to believe that future cleanup will be paid for. But who ends up paying that? The taxpayers.

These groups are ignoring two important items. One is that the leaking underground storage tank program which the manufacturers believe will bail them out is not appropriately funded right now. They are not cleaning anything up as they should be and many of the State programs are broke. Right now EPA oversees 700,000 leaking underground storage sites. Of the 700,000 underground storage sites, 136,000 are currently leaking, and they are not being cleaned up.

EPA anticipates that over the next 10 years, 120,000 new leaks will occur. Despite the need for cleanup funds and the growing inability of the funds needed to clean these up, we know that this administration cut back by 8 percent that fund.

State programs right now like California and other places are also being starved of this much needed funding.

Twelve States have funds with more claims than money. Two State funds have gone bankrupt. Fifteen State funds are funded only by gas taxes, and five States do not even have cleanup funds.

The provision in the House energy bill and any deal that may be struck is going to leave our taxpayers holding the bag. No deal is going to help our communities bear the burden for the rest of the cleanup. The only way to fairly and adequately pay for the cleanup is to allow for those manufacturers to be found responsible and accountable.

Lastly, I want to say also that the House Republican energy bill fails to address the Nation's record gas prices; and according to the Bush administration's own energy department, they would actually cause gas prices to increase.

Hello? What are we doing here today by not addressing the consumers' needs right now where gas prices and a barrel of oil is up to \$60 a barrel.

We need reform. We need something that is going to help our consumers, and we do not want to see more of our water polluted by MTBE. Support the motion to instruct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how many speakers does the gentlewoman have?

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further speakers, just closing comments of my own.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, back in the middle of the Depression in the late 1920s or the early 1930s, the east Texas oil field was discovered, and at that time it was the world's largest oil field. And since it was discovered by a man named Joiner

who was an independent, all kinds of folks rushed in to get a piece of that action.

It was not discovered by the major oil companies, and so literally tens of thousands of people from all over the country came to east Texas and to Kilgore and to Longview to try to make their fortune.

The law enforcement facilities and the personnel were just overwhelmed. So finally in desperation, one of the county judges called down to Austin to speak to the Governor of Texas. He said, Governor, we are being overwhelmed here. We have a riot on our hands. Can you send the Texas National Guard and the Texas Rangers? Could you send us some help so we can restore law and order? The Governor of Texas said, I will be happy to do that.

So about a day later, the sheriff and the county judge and some of the county commissioners, they went to the train station to meet the help. And they were expecting hundreds, if not thousands, of troops and Rangers to step off the train; and one lonely Texas Ranger, a grizzled old guy stepped off the train. The county judge says, I called the Governor and I asked for help, where is it? The Ranger said, You are looking at it. The county judge said, We got a riot on our hands. And the Ranger said, How many riots? And the judge said, One. The Ranger said, Well, I am one Ranger. One Ranger, one riot. And he proceeded to quell the disturbance.

Well, we have heard from our friends, and they are my friends, every one of them except for one that just spoke is a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. They are all good people. Not one of them voted for the energy bill. That is okay. That is what democracy is all about.

You have heard the other side of the story, but that may not be the whole story. There is another side to this story on MTBE, and let us talk about it.

Our distinguished minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), when she spoke, stood up and said that back when they began to put MTBE in the gasoline, the manufacturers knew that it would leak. They knew that it would leak.

Well, let me ask you a question. If you put something in a tank underground and the tank is not tight, is it going to leak or not leak? The answer is it is going to leak if you do not have a tank that is not leakproof. So to say they knew MTBE would leak is to say they knew there were leaking underground storage tanks.

You put gasoline in a storage tank underground, whatever is in that gasoline, if there is a leak in the tank, it is going to leak. That is a fact. So when MTBE leaks, which is a fact, it is not just the MTBE. It is everything else in the gasoline. It is the benzene and all the other additives and the gasoline itself.

Now, to say that the solution to that is to ban MTBE is to say if I cut my

arm and it is bleeding, instead of putting a BandAid on it and stopping the leak, I drain the blood out of my body. That is one way to stop the leak. But that may not be the most cost-effective and the most sensible way.

Now, surprising as it may be, under existing law we have a leaking underground storage tank fund called the LUST fund. It was specifically set up in law to prevent tanks from leaking, to have a mechanism to pay to repair these underground storage tanks. Just one problem, the law did not say the money that goes into the fund has to be used just for leaking underground storage tanks.

So what have the States done? They have used it for every purpose but that. We set up this fund. We funded it. We put money into the trust fund. We send that money to the States, and the States use it for any purpose. Some States actually do use it to repair and maintain leaking underground storage tanks, but not many.

This bill that my friends who have just been speaking voted against has a provision in it that says the States have to use some of the money for the underground storage tanks. And, in fact, it doubles the amount and it sets up a maintenance program where the States have to go out and actually enforce the law in this bill that is pending. That is my first point.

The gentlewoman who is offering the amendment said, and she is right, there are 2,600 water systems in this country that have MTBE contamination. She says it and I am going to say it is a fact. I have no reason to doubt that.

What she does not say because the reports that she studies do not tell her is what the level is. Now, the EPA standard is somewhere between 20 and 40 parts per billion. Some States have a tighter standard, as low as 13 parts per billion. The problem is, with all of these lawsuits that have been filed, the trial lawyers have found out that you can detect MTBE down to one part per billion. Somebody shows up in your city council office and says, we have a lawsuit on MTBE contamination. Can we check your water supply? Of course they are going to say, sure, check the water supply.

They come back and say, you got MTBE contamination, 2 parts per billion. Oh, my God. Let us join up. Well, unless you have got the most sensitive nose, you are not even going to be able to smell it, but it is there. It is way below the standard.

Now, if the State wants to set a standard even lower than 13 parts per billion, I have got no problem with that. If the State wants to ban MTBE, which some States have, I have got no problem with that. But to sit here and say that you have all this contamination, well, I could take a thumbful of MTBE and take it out and throw it on the ground out here in the Capitol. And if it rains very quickly after that, the thumbful gets into the water system, the wastewater run-off here in Washington, D.C., and some of that goes to

a reservoir and the city of Washington gets some of its drinking water from that reservoir, it might show up at one part per billion.

□ 1430

That does not mean it is contaminated in the real sense, but it does mean there is some MTBE in there.

So the fact that we have all these water systems that claim contamination, part of that is because the trial lawyers have been going on and recruiting people to join the lawsuit, and they go out and study their water supply and they may actually be able to find a little MTBE in it.

The next thing, and my friend from Maine talked about the fact that MTBE was not mandated under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1991. He is telling you the truth. But, again, as he pointed out, we did not mandate MTBE but we did mandate that you had to put an oxygenate requirement of 2 percent by weight. At that time, there were two ways to do it: One was ethanol and the other was MTBE.

Now, since that time, the oil and gas industry has come up with a product called reformulated gasoline that meets the minimum standard for combustion under the Clean Air Act Amendments, so there are now three ways to do it. But at the time there were two, and it was a mandate. So we told the industry, if you are in a non-attainment area, you have to put one of two things, MTBE or ethanol, in your gasoline during certain parts of the year so that you get better combustion in the engine so that you get cleaner air quality.

That was a good thing, not a bad thing. And what did they find out? They found out that those communities who used the MTBE, it was much more cost effective. It cost less money; and two, it cleaned the air better, about 40 percent better than ethanol, 40 percent. But, as has been pointed out, if you store it in a tank that leaks, it may leak. And when the gasoline leaks, the MTBE as part of the gasoline leaks and the MTBE does get into the water table and that does cause an odor.

Now, the last thing I want to talk about is this study that has been leaked. Is it not interesting we are having a debate about leaking underground storage tanks and a study has been leaked from the EPA? Heaven help us. This study that has been leaked is a draft study. It has not been peer reviewed. It will probably never become part of an actual public document that is presented to the Congress. But the folks at EPA understand the energy bill is about to go to conference, and those that agree that MTBE is not a good thing, somebody over there has conveniently leaked a draft report that says MTBE is now a likely carcinogen. Likely.

Well, I drink a lot of Diet Dr. Pepper. And my guess is if I were to drink ten gallons of Diet Dr. Pepper everyday for

the rest of my life, I might develop cancer because of that. I do not think that MTBE, under the standard that is in current law, is a carcinogen, and all the studies that I have seen that have tried to prove it have come back just the opposite. So to hang our hat now on a draft study that has not been peer reviewed and has been leaked by the EPA, to me, is pretty weak soup indeed.

Let me just say that we are getting ready to go to conference with the other body. That is a good thing, not a bad thing on the energy bill. We need to find a compromise on MTBE. I think that is a good thing, not a bad thing. And I agree with some of the proponents of the Capps amendment that the manufacturers and the distributors and the retailers and the refiners, the people in the chain of custody for MTBE should help pay to clean up the water systems that are contaminated. Should. Should. So the compromise that we have been working on for several months now says that they have to do that.

We actually are going to set up a specific fund just for MTBE remediation, and that fund is going to be sufficiently funded to pay for the actual cleanup and remediation of contaminated sites. It is not going to pay for trial lawyers' contingency fees. Not going to do that. But if you are one of these water systems that has real contamination and you want it cleaned up, if this compromise becomes a part of the bill and the bill becomes law, you are going to get your water site cleaned up very quickly and you are not going to have any MTBE contamination in it.

If what you are really trying to do is enrich the pockets of the trial lawyers, when they talk about \$85 billion or \$30 billion or whatever the number is, most of that money is trial lawyer contingency fees. I am not in that game. I am about good government. I am about real cleanup. I am about a cleaner environment. And the bill that I hope to report back as a conference report, if I have anything to do with it, is going to have a compromise on MTBE that does exactly that.

The people that have helped cause the problem are going to help pay for it and help to clean it up. The communities that want clean water are going to get it quicker and sooner under the compromise that will be in our bill. I would think that the majority of the House, including 41 Democrats who voted for the energy bill when it went to the Senate, are going to continue to agree with me. And if that is the case, I hope they will vote against this Capps motion to instruct, as they already have done once at the end of the debate on the energy bill, and let us go to conference and find a real compromise to solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my esteemed colleague, who is in opposition to this amendment and, indeed, he, the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, is my friend and friends of all of us who have spoken today who are members of his committee. But I wish to comment on some of the remarks he made in his speech.

First, regarding the list funds which he spoke about as being a place for managing this pollution. Stopping the leaks from the tanks stops additional MTBE contamination, Mr. Chairman, but it does nothing about existing contamination, and that is the contamination that has polluted over 2,300 water districts across this country in 36 different States.

Second, the chairman referred to the very minute amounts of MTBE that have polluted all of this groundwater that we have been discussing. And it is true that the groundwater is rendered unusable because of the strong smell and taste of kerosene, even in a very small amount of MTBE which is in the groundwater. But I would argue, respectfully, that the American people deserve to know that the Environmental Protection Agency has a report, even though it is a draft report, because it identifies the state of a likely carcinogen that MTBE contains. Even if it is nothing more than a small amount, I do not believe, as a public health nurse, that we want to contaminate our drinking water with even a small amount of a likely carcinogen.

Third, I want to get back to the point about the liability of manufacturers of MTBE who knew when they created this product in the 1970s as an additive to gasoline that it was toxic and that it would pollute groundwater. Here is a statement from the deposition of Curt Stanley, a Shell Oil remediation expert, which is part of the testimony for the South Lake Tahoe water district when it was presented with a huge lawsuit against the Shell Company.

The question was asked: "So is it fair to say," and this is taken from testimony, "that by 1981, the Shell Oil Company knew that MTBE in its gasoline could contaminate public drinking water supplies?" The answer is: "Yes." Question: "And is it also fair to say that they knew by that time that it created taste and odor problems in public drinking water supplies?" The answer: "Yes." And the final question: "And did you report those facts to the Shell management?" And the answer is: "Yes."

Since at least that time, 1981, the oil companies, the MTBE manufacturers knew that they were making a defective product and knowingly they continued to manufacture it.

Now, the chairman described the compromise that has been worked out on the underlying bill, and in doing so, interestingly, acknowledges fault on the part of the MTBE manufacturers, because they are liable if they are going to be part of the deal in coming to a conclusion. "They should pay," he

says. I say, "they must pay." They must be held accountable. And the deal that is struck is one in which they will pay only a portion of the damages and the taxpayers will pay the remainder.

The House Republican energy bill fails to address this Nation's record gas prices. And according to the Bush administration's own Energy Department would actually cause gas prices to increase, and that at a time when they are increasing. This energy bill we are now going to be considering in conference will do nothing to cause containment of that increase in gas prices. Instead of giving real relief to consumers, this Republican bill gives loads of new tax breaks and loopholes to special interests. And the worst example of these special interest giveaways is the complete liability shield for MTBE manufacturers, a shield that will shift billions of dollars in cleanup costs from MTBE manufacturers to the American taxpayer.

MTBE is responsible for polluting groundwater in so many communities across this country. Cleanup costs are estimated in the billions, \$28 billion to maybe as high as over \$50 billion. MTBE manufacturers are now being held accountable in court, but this provision would end that accountability. I would remind Members that it was the special protections granted to MTBE manufacturers that brought this bill down in the last Congress. Senate leaders have made it clear they are not including this grossly unwanted get-out-of-jail-free card for the MTBE this year either.

So I know many Members of the House have school boards, have water districts or towns with lawsuits against MTBE manufacturers, and those lawsuits are going to be voided. Null. They are not going to be able to proceed under this energy bill. Your constituents would lose their right to hold these manufacturers of MTBE accountable for the pollution in their groundwater. And the billions in MTBE cleanup that your communities face will be shifted from the oil companies, who have record profits and who caused the problem, to your constituents, who have to live with the problem.

Make no mistake, that is what this vote is all about. By voting for the motion to instruct conferees, you will be saying that it is not okay to make your constituents pay for pollution that they did not cause, but that was caused by MTBE manufacturers. The special protection in this bill for MTBE manufacturers is completely unwarranted and it will cost your constituents a fortune.

So I urge you to vote for the motion to instruct conferees. Vote for the Capps motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1445

#### DEFICIT CONTINUES TO SHRINK

(Mr. CRENSHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this morning the President announced some very good economic news: Our economy continues to grow and our deficit continues to shrink. That is good news. Why is that happening?

Number one, we gave tax relief to the American people so they can keep more of what they earned, and that has helped create an awful lot of new jobs, and this year we put the brakes on Federal spending when we wrote our budget and passed our spending bills this year. We actually spend less money next year than we did last year. Spending goes down. When we take out homeland security and defense, discretionary spending is reduced.

Mr. Speaker, that is what every American family has to do. They write a budget and then they stay within the budget, and we did just that. That is great news for the American taxpayers, that is why the economy continues to grow. That is why interest rates are down. That is why jobs are up and unemployment is down.

That economic news is something we have been waiting to hear. When you give tax relief and put the brakes on Federal spending, good news happens and the economy is growing.

#### SHRINKING BUDGET DEFICIT

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget just released their deficit figures today. It is very telling.

A year ago, we projected the Federal budget deficit would be \$521 billion. This year we projected the deficit would be \$427 billion. Well, the budget deficit just came in at \$333 billion. Down \$94 billion this year, down \$188 billion from last year. This is progress.

Mr. Speaker, why did this happen? Two reasons. When we cut taxes 2 years ago almost to this day, we increased economic growth in jobs. Many people said when we were going to cut tax, by

cutting taxes on families and small businesses and job creators, we would blow a hole through the deficit and increase the deficit.

What happened? Tax receipts from those taxes went up. Taxes receipts are up. There has been a 41 percent increase in corporate tax revenues, 17 percent increase in individual income tax revenues. Because we lowered the tax on workers and people, we grew jobs and have more tax revenues coming in.

The next thing we have to do is watch our spending. That is why it is important we kept the level on spending as we have done this year. We need to stay on this course to get rid of this budget deficit once and for all by growing the economy, keeping taxes low and keeping the lid on pending.

#### KARL ROVE HAS COOPERATED

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with concern and in opposition to the partisan attacks on Karl Rove. I think we see too many efforts now where people quickly rush to judgment, rush to call for the most bizarre solutions to problems that are problems which are often just created in their own minds.

Karl Rove has fully cooperated in any investigation and, for more than a year now, has permitted investigators to talk to him. I think The Wall Street Journal put it best today when, in an editorial that I will submit as part of my remarks, and to quote directly from that editorial, the editors summed up this episode by stating: "In short, Joe Wilson hadn't told the truth about what he discovered in Africa, how he'd discovered it, what he'd told the CIA about it, or even why he was sent on the mission. The media and the Kerry campaign promptly abandoned him, though the former never did give as much prominence to his debunking as they did to his original accusations. But if anyone can remember another public figure so entirely and thoroughly discredited, let us know."

Mr. Speaker, I will submit The Wall Street Journal editorial for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 2005]

KARL ROVE, WHISTLEBLOWER

Democrats and most of the Beltway press corps are baying for Karl Rove's head over his role in exposing a case of CIA nepotism involving Joe Wilson and his wife, Valerie Plame. On the contrary, we'd say the White House political guru deserves a prize—perhaps the next iteration of the "Truth-Telling" award that The Nation magazine bestowed upon Mr. Wilson before the Senate Intelligence Committee exposed him as a fraud.

For Mr. Rove is turning out to be the real "whistleblower" in this whole sorry pseudoscandal. He's the one who warned Time's Matthew Cooper and other reporters to be



wary of Mr. Wilson's credibility. He's the one who told the press the truth that Mr. Wilson had been recommended for the CIA consulting gig by his wife, not by Vice President Dick Cheney as Mr. Wilson was asserting on the airwaves. In short, Mr. Rove provided important background so Americans could understand that Mr. Wilson wasn't a whistleblower but was a partisan trying to discredit the Iraq War in an election campaign. Thank you, Mr. Rove.

Media chants aside, there's no evidence that Mr. Rove broke any laws in telling reporters that Ms. Plame may have played a role in her husband's selection for a 2002 mission to investigate reports that Iraq was seeking uranium ore in Niger. To be prosecuted under the 1982 Intelligence Identities Protection Act, Mr. Rove would have had to have deliberately and maliciously exposed Ms. Plame knowing that she was an undercover agent and using information he'd obtained in an official capacity. But it appears Mr. Rove didn't even know Ms. Plame's name and had only heard about her work at Langley from other journalists.

On the "no underlying crime" point, moreover, no less than the New York Times and Washington Post now agree. So do the 36 major news organizations that filed a legal brief in March aimed at keeping Mr. Cooper and the New York Times's Judith Miller out of jail.

"While an investigation of the leak was justified, it is far from clear—at least on the public record—that a crime took place," the Post noted the other day. Granted the media have come a bit late to this understanding, and then only to protect their own, but the logic of their argument is that Mr. Rove did nothing wrong either.

The same can't be said for Mr. Wilson, who first "outed" himself as a CIA consultant in a melodramatic New York Times op-ed in July 2003. At the time he claimed to have thoroughly debunked the Iraq-Niger yellowcake uranium connection that President Bush had mentioned in his now famous "16 words" on the subject in that year's State of the Union address.

Mr. Wilson also vehemently denied it when columnist Robert Novak first reported that his wife had played a role in selecting him for the Niger mission. He promptly signed up as adviser to the Kerry campaign and was feted almost everywhere in the media, including repeat appearances on NBC's "Meet the Press" and a photo spread (with Valerie) in *Vanity Fair*.

But his day in the political sun was short-lived. The bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee report last July cited the note that Ms. Plame had sent recommending her husband for the Niger mission. "Interviews and documents provided to the Committee indicate that his wife, a CPD [Counterproliferation Division] employee, suggested his name for the trip," said the report.

The same bipartisan report also pointed out that the forged documents Mr. Wilson claimed to have discredited hadn't even entered intelligence channels until eight months after his trip. And it said the CIA interpreted the information he provided in his debrief as mildly supportive of the suspicion that Iraq had been seeking uranium in Niger.

About the same time, another inquiry headed by Britain's Lord Butler delivered its own verdict on the 16 words: "We conclude also that the statement in President Bush's State of the Union Address of 28 January 2003 that 'The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa' was well-founded."

In short, Joe Wilson hadn't told the truth about what he'd discovered in Africa, how

he'd discovered it, what he'd told the CIA about it, or even why he was sent on the mission. The media and the Kerry campaign promptly abandoned him, though the former never did give as much prominence to his debunking as they did to his original accusations. But if anyone can remember another public figure so entirely and thoroughly discredited, let us know.

If there's any scandal at all here, it is that this entire episode has been allowed to waste so much government time and media attention, not to mention inspire a "special counsel" probe. The Bush Administration is also guilty on this count, since it went along with the appointment of prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald in an election year in order to punt the issue down the road. But now Mr. Fitzgerald has become an unguided missile, holding reporters in contempt for not disclosing their sources even as it becomes clearer all the time that no underlying crime was at issue.

As for the press corps, rather than calling for Mr. Rove to be fired, they ought to be grateful to him for telling the truth.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### RULING BY JUDGE YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues and the people of this country are not aware that the shoe bomber that was on the plane that was going to blow up that plane and kill all those innocent people was recently convicted and sentenced. People across this country did not see on television the judge's decision or hear what the judge said, so I want to read to the American people and my colleagues part of what Judge William Young said in that decision in putting that man in jail for two or three life sentences.

He said, We are not afraid of you or your terrorist conspirators, Mr. Reid. We are Americans. We have been through the fire before. You are not an enemy combatant, you are a terrorist. You are not a soldier in any war. You are a terrorist. To give you that reference to call you a soldier gives you far too much stature.

Whether it is the officers of government who do it or your attorney who does it, or if you think you are a soldier, you are not. You are a terrorist, and we do not negotiate with terrorists. We do not meet with terrorists.

We do not sign documents with terrorists. We hunt them down one by one and bring them to justice, so war talk is way out of line in this court. You are a big fellow, but are not that big. You are no warrior, I have known warriors. You are a terrorist, a species of criminal that is guilty of multiple attempted murders.

In a very real sense, State Trooper Santiago had it right when he first took you off the plane and into custody and you wondered where the press and TV were, and he said, You are no big deal. You are no big deal. What your able counsel and what the equally able United States attorneys have grappled with, and what I have as honesty as I know how, have tried to grapple with is why you did something so horrific. What was it that led you to this courtroom today?

I have listened respectfully to what you have had to say, and I ask you to search your heart and ask yourself what sort of unfathomable hate led you to do what you are guilty of doing and what you admitted you were doing. And I have an answer for you. It may not satisfy you, but as I search this entire record, it comes as close to understanding as I know. It seems to me that you hate the one thing that to us is most precious. You hate our freedom. Our individual freedom. Our individual freedom to live as we choose, to come and go as we choose, to believe or not believe as we individually choose.

Here in this society, the very wind carries freedom. It carries it everywhere from sea to shining sea. It is because we prize individual freedom so much that you are here today in this beautiful courtroom so that everyone can see, can truly see that justice is administered fairly, individually, and discretely.

It is for freedom's sake that your lawyers are striving so vigorously on your behalf and have filed appeals, will go on in their representation of you before other judges.

We as Americans are all about freedom. Because we all know the way we treat you, Mr. Reid, is the measure of our own liberties. Make no mistake though. It is yet true that we will bear any burden, pay any price to preserve our freedoms. Look around this courtroom and mark it well. The world is not going to long remember what you or I say here today. The day after tomorrow, it will be forgotten. But this, however, will long endure.

Here in this courtroom and courtrooms all across America, the American people will gather to see justice, individual justice, justice, not war, individual justice is, in fact, being done.

The very President of the United States, through his officers, will have to come into courtrooms and lay out evidence on which specific matters can be judged and juries of citizens will gather to sit and judge that evidence democratically, to mold and shape and refine our sense of justice.



You see that flag, Mr. Reid? That is the flag of the United States of America. That flag will fly there long after this and you will all be forgotten. That flag stands for freedom. And it always will.

Mr. Custody Officer, stand him down.

RULING BY JUDGE WILLIAM YOUNG, U.S. DISTRICT COURT: SENTENCING OF SHOE BOMBER RICHARD C. REID

Prior to sentencing, the Judge asked the defendant if he had anything to say.

His response: After admitting his guilt to the court for the record, Reid also admitted his "allegiance to Osama bin Laden, to Islam, and to the religion of Allah," defiantly stated "I think I will not apologize for my actions," and told the court "I am at war with your country."

Judge Young then delivered the statement quoted below:

January 30, 2003, United States vs. Reid.

Judge Young: "Mr. Richard C. Reid, hearken now to the sentence the Court imposes upon you.

"On counts 1, 5 and 6 the Court sentences you to life in prison in the custody of the United States Attorney General.

"On counts 2, 3, 4 and 7, the Court sentences you to 20 years in prison on each count, the sentence on each count to run consecutive with the other.

"That's 80 years.

"On count 8 the Court sentences you to the mandatory 30 years consecutive to the 80 years just imposed.

"The Court imposes upon you each of the eight counts a fine of \$250,000 for the aggregate fine of \$2 million.

"The Court accepts the government's recommendation with respect to restitution and orders restitution in the amount of \$298.17 to Andre Bousquet and \$5,784 to American Airlines.

"The Court imposes upon you the \$800 special assessment.

"The Court imposes upon you five years supervised release simply because the law requires it.

"But the life sentences are real life sentences so I need go no further.

"This is the sentence that is provided for by our statutes.

"It is a fair and just sentence.

"It is a righteous sentence.

"Let me explain this to you.

"We are not afraid of you or any of your terrorist co-conspirators, Mr. Reid.

"We are Americans. We have been through the fire before.

"There is all too much war talk here and I say that to everyone with the utmost respect.

"Here in this court, we deal with individuals as individuals and care for individuals as individuals.

"As human beings, we reach out for justice.

"You are not an enemy combatant.

"You are a terrorist.

"You are not a soldier in any war.

"You are a terrorist.

"To give you that reference, to call you a soldier, gives you far too much stature.

"Whether it is the officers of government who do it or your attorney who does it, or if you think you are a soldier.

"You are not—you are a terrorist.

"And we do not negotiate with terrorists.

"We do not meet with terrorists.

"We do not sign documents with terrorists.

"We hunt them down one by one and bring them to justice.

"So war talk is way out of line in this court.

"You are a big fellow.

"But you are not that big.

"You're no warrior.

"I've known warriors.

"You are a terrorist.

"A species of criminal that is guilty of multiple attempted murders.

"In a very real sense, State Trooper Santiago had it right when you first were taken off that plane and into custody and you wondered where the press and where the TV crews were, and he said: 'You're no big deal.'

"You are no big deal.

"What your able counsel and what the equally able United States attorneys have grappled with and what I have as honestly as I know how tried to grapple with, is why you did something so horrific.

"What was it that led you here to this courtroom today?

"I have listened respectfully to what you have to say.

"And I ask you to search your heart and ask yourself what sort of unfathomable hate led you to do what you are guilty and admit you are guilty of doing.

"And I have an answer for you.

"It may not satisfy you, but as I search this entire record, it comes as close to understanding as I know.

"It seems to me you hate the one thing that to us is most precious.

"You hate our freedom.

"Our individual freedom.

"Our individual freedom to live as we choose, to come and go as we choose, to believe or not believe as we individually choose.

"Here, in this society, the very wind carries freedom.

"It carries it everywhere from sea to shining sea.

"It is because we prize individual freedom so much that you are here in this beautiful courtroom.

"So that everyone can see, truly see, that justice is administered fairly, individually, and discretely.

"It is for freedom's sake that your lawyers are striving so vigorously on your behalf and have filed appeals, will go on in their representation of you before other judges.

"We Americans are all about freedom.

"Because we all know that the way we treat you, Mr. Reid, is the measure of our own liberties.

"Make no mistake though.

"It is yet true that we will bear any burden; pay any price, to preserve our freedoms.

"Look around this courtroom. Mark it well.

"The world is not going to long remember what you or I say here.

"Day after tomorrow, it will be forgotten, but this, however, will long endure.

"Here in this courtroom and courtrooms all across America, the American people will gather to see that justice, individual justice, justice, not war, individual justice is in fact being done.

"The very President of the United States through his officers will have to come into courtrooms and lay out evidence on which specific matters can be judged and juries of citizens will gather to sit and judge that evidence democratically, to mold and shape and refine our sense of justice.

"See that flag, Mr. Reid?

"That's the flag of the United States of America.

"That flag will fly there long after this is all forgotten.

"That flag stands for freedom. And it always will.

"Mr. Custody Officer. Stand him down."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IN-STATE COLLEGE TUITION FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS DEFIES COMMON SENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, America has the best public universities in the world. We have some of the best ones in Texas where I am from. Many Americans want to go to college. Parents want to send their kids to our public universities. Parents and students sometimes save for years to attend college. It is expensive, especially for the middle class. The rich can always pay; good for them. And the poor sometimes get grants and go to college, but it is the middle class that struggles, for a lifetime, sometimes, to send their kids to school.

Some students decide to go a university in another State. They are penalized by that State and required to pay out-of-State tuition since they are from out of State.

Citizens from other countries apply for Visas to come to the United States to go to public universities. If they are accepted, they pay out-of-State tuition since they are from out of State. These are citizens who come here legally and then go back to their native lands.

But, Mr. Speaker, if a person is in the United States illegally, they can get admitted to State universities and pay in-State tuition. So if a person is illegally here from, let us say, France, they apply to a State university. If they are admitted, they pay in-State tuition. But they are from out of State, not to mention they should not even be here. They are violating American law by just their presence.

So we continue to reward illegal behavior. This policy discriminates against American kids who want to go to, let us say, the University of Kansas from some other State. This policy also discriminates against foreign citizens who come here legally to go to college. It encourages more illegal immigration.

College admissions are so competitive now that even allowing illegals to attend our universities may prevent American citizens from being accepted. And who pays for this nonsense? Americans pay. They always pay. We cannot continue to subsidize illegal immigration and the benefits illegals receive.

There are several States that provide for in-State tuition for illegal individuals. The State that started this was my home State of Texas. If you go to the University of Texas and you are an in-State resident, you pay about \$7,000. If you are from Oklahoma just across the Red River, you pay \$10,000 more, about \$17,000.

Kansas, if you are an in-State resident, you pay about \$5,000. Out of State, about \$13,000, and the same is true in several other States.

State University of New York: In State, \$5,250; out of State, \$11,200. University of Kansas: In State, \$5,413, out of State, \$13,865. University of Texas: In State, \$7,438; out of State, \$17,474.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. This penalizes American kids and rewards illegal conduct. This defies common sense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### REMEMBERING ADMIRAL JIM STOCKDALE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the floor briefly and comment on the passing of Admiral Jim Stockdale, one of the great heroes of our time.

Jim Stockdale, when he passed away was a resident of San Diego, California, with his wonderful wife, Sybil.

This occasion I think brought America's focus back to what Jim Stockdale accomplished and the enormity of his service to our country. I just thought it might be the right time to talk about that a little bit and about that extraordinary heroism that he demonstrated at a time when Americans had largely turned away from the operation in Vietnam.

Jim Stockdale was shot down, and I know that my two colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), who shared a cell with Jim Stockdale in the Hanoi Hilton, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) who was the most proficient Navy pilot of that period, in fact the only Navy ace in the Vietnam conflict, would want to be with me talking about Jim.

But Jim Stockdale was shot down and was incarcerated in the Hanoi Hilton. At one point, the North Viet-

namese wanted to use him for propaganda purposes. To keep them from being able to do that, he broke up a stool that was in his cell and beat his own face with the stool almost beyond recognition so that he had no value to the North Vietnamese in terms of being an image that they could broadcast for propaganda purposes.

He was a leader in the true sense of the term. He led his men in that prison under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. He showed incredible heroism. In reviewing the exploits of American pilots, and they are numerous because one thing that America has always had is a great pool of individuals who are willing to go out and risk their lives. Ever since the days when we flew biplanes in World War I, to the current operations over Iraq and Afghanistan, we have always had extraordinary Americans who, as James Michener said in his book "The Bridges of Toko-Ri," would fly off those little postage stamps that you call aircraft carriers and fly over and hit difficult targets, sometimes under enormous defensive fire, and then return back to that small carrier out at sea somewhere and try to make that extraordinarily difficult landing.

□ 1500

Michener asked, Where do we get such men? Where does America get such men? The answer is, we have always had them and they are sometimes guys like RANDY CUNNINGHAM or SAM JOHNSON or, in this case, Jim Stockdale. Jim Stockdale when he was shot down really had the greatest challenge of his military career because that was a time when he had to be a leader, not in an aircraft that was going to return to a ship where he could live in some degree of comfort and convenience with his fellow pilots, but his war zone then was reduced to the small spaces that constituted the cells of the Hanoi Hilton.

He so inspired his men and so extended himself and endured torture to the degree that his countrymen who had served with him were unanimous when he was recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor, they were unanimous in their support of Jim Stockdale for this Nation's highest honor, to go along with all of the other combat decorations that he had.

I just thought, Mr. Speaker, it might be a good time to remind Americans what a great hero Jim Stockdale was and what a great model he is for our Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCAUL of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MACK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2005 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2005 THROUGH FY 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2005 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act. This status report is current through July 8, 2005.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95, the conference report on the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2005 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 through 2009. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order

against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2005 with the total of "section 302(b)" suballocations among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures reported by the Appropriations Committee that would breach its section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority.

#### REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2005 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95

[Reflecting Action Completed as of July 8, 2005—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—	
	2005	2005–2009
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	2,078,456	n.a.
Outlays .....	2,056,006	n.a.
Revenues .....	1,483,658	8,519,748
Current Level:		
Budget Authority .....	2,073,462	n.a.
Outlays .....	2,055,979	n.a.
Revenues .....	1,484,065	8,603,391
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	–4,994	n.a.
Outlays .....	–27	n.a.

#### DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 8, 2005

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2005		2005–2009 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation .....	0	0	400	400
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–400	–400
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation .....	0	0	1,525	1,525
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–1,525	–1,525
Financial Services:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Government Reform:				
Allocation .....	0	0	50	50
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–50	–50
House Administration:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
Allocation .....	0	0	6	6
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–6	–6
Resources:				
Allocation .....	6	6	45	45
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–6	–6	–45	–45
Science:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0

#### REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2005 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95—Continued

[Reflecting Action Completed as of July 8, 2005—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—	
	2005	2005–2009
Revenues .....	407	83,643

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2006 through 2009 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2005 in excess of \$4,994,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

#### OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2005 in excess of \$27,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

#### REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2005 in excess of \$407,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009 in excess of \$83,643,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION  
COMPLETED AS OF JULY 8, 2005—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2005		2005–2009 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation .....	3,488	0	12,238	0
Current Level .....	31	0	31	0
Difference .....	–3,457	0	–12,207	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation .....	554	64	1,800	1,558
Current Level .....	81	45	242	240
Difference .....	–473	–19	–1,558	–1,318

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations <sup>1</sup>		Current level reflecting action completed as of July 8, 2005		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA .....	n.a.	n.a.	18,689	18,844	n.a.	n.a.
Defense .....	n.a.	n.a.	352,127	398,270	n.a.	n.a.
Energy & Water Development .....	n.a.	n.a.	30,533	30,107	n.a.	n.a.
Foreign Operations .....	n.a.	n.a.	18,892	25,898	n.a.	n.a.
Homeland Security .....	n.a.	n.a.	38,469	31,925	n.a.	n.a.
Interior-Environment .....	n.a.	n.a.	26,969	26,874	n.a.	n.a.
Labor, HHS & Education .....	n.a.	n.a.	143,180	141,773	n.a.	n.a.
Legislative Branch .....	n.a.	n.a.	3,545	3,785	n.a.	n.a.
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs .....	n.a.	n.a.	80,263	76,417	n.a.	n.a.
Science-State-Justice-Commerce .....	n.a.	n.a.	58,438	57,956	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC .....	n.a.	n.a.	67,873	117,669	n.a.	n.a.
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation) <sup>1</sup> .....	840,036	929,520	838,978	929,518	–1,058	–2

<sup>1</sup> Appropriations Committee has not submitted the subcommittee allocations since the restructuring of the committee.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of  
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2005 budget and is current through July 8, 2005. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the

technical and economic assumptions for fiscal year 2005 that underlie H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report).

Since my last letter, dated May 26, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following three acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2005:

The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–14);

The TANF Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–19); and

The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II (Public Law 109–20).

In addition, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005 (S. 714). The effects of the actions listed above are detailed in the enclosed report.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,  
Director.

FISCAL YEAR 2005 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JULY 8, 2005

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: <sup>1</sup>			
Revenues .....	n.a.	n.a.	1,484,024
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	1,191,357	1,102,621	n.a.
Appropriation legislation .....	1,298,963	1,369,221	n.a.
Offsetting receipts .....	–415,912	–415,912	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous session: .....	2,074,408	2,055,930	1,484,024
Enacted this session:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109–13) <sup>2</sup> .....	–1,058	4	41
Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–14) .....	16	0	0
TANF Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–19) .....	81	45	0
Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II (P.L. 109–20) .....	15	0	0
Total, enacted this session: .....	–946	49	41
Passed, pending signature: Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005 (S. 714) .....	0	0	*
Total Current Level <sup>2,3</sup> .....	2,073,462	2,055,979	1,484,065
Total Budget Resolution .....	2,078,456	2,056,006	1,483,658
Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	407
Current Level Under Budget Resolution .....	4,994	27	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2005–2009:			
House Current Level .....	n.a.	n.a.	8,603,391
House Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	8,519,748
Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	83,643
Current Level Under Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law; \* = less than \$500,000.

<sup>1</sup> The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (P.L. 109–7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$83,140 million in budget authority and \$33,034 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109–13).

<sup>3</sup> Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2006 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2006 THROUGH FY 2010

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2006 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 401 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through July 8, 2005.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2006 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2006 and fiscal years 2006 through 2010. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the sec-

tion 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2006 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation as well as the 302(a) allocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2007 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills or amendments thereto that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 95

[Reflecting Action Completed as of July 8, 2005—  
On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2006	Fiscal years 2006–2010
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	2,144,384	n.a.
Outlays .....	2,161,420	n.a.
Revenues .....	1,589,892	9,080,006
Current Level:		
Budget Authority .....	1,320,959	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	1,645,064	( <sup>1</sup> )

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 8, 2005

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2006		2006–2010 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation .....	100	100	500	500
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–100	–100	–500	–500
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation .....	100	100	2,000	2,000
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–100	–100	–2,000	–2,000
Financial Services:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Government Reform:				
Allocation .....	50	50	50	50
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–50	–50	–50	–50
House Administration:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
Allocation .....	6	6	6	6
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–6	–6	–6	–6
Resources:				
Allocation .....	8	8	50	50
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–8	–8	–50	–50

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 95—Continued

[Reflecting Action Completed as of July 8, 2005—  
On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2006	Fiscal years 2006–2010
Revenues .....	1,607,661	9,185,688
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	–823,425	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	–516,356	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	17,769	105,682

<sup>1</sup>Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2007 through 2010 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2006 in excess of \$823,425,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2006 in excess of \$516,356,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2006 in excess of \$17,769,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 in excess of \$105,682,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION  
COMPLETED AS OF JULY 8, 2005—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2006		2006–2010 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Science:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation .....	3,027	0	4,107	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–3,027	0	–4,107	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation .....	350	346	1,537	1,914
Current Level .....	148	165	161	195
Difference .....	–202	–181	–1,376	–1,719

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of June 22, 2005 (H. Rpt. 109–145)		Current level reflecting action completed as of July 8, 2005		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA .....	16,832	18,691	7	5,399	–16,825	–13,292
Defense .....	363,440	372,696	27	126,306	–363,413	–246,390
Energy & Water Development .....	29,746	30,273	36	11,092	–29,710	–19,181
Foreign Operations .....	20,270	25,080	0	17,091	–20,270	–7,989
Homeland Security .....	30,846	33,233	0	14,762	–30,846	–18,471
Interior-Environment .....	26,107	27,500	0	11,504	–26,107	–15,996
Labor, HHS & Education .....	142,514	143,802	19,166	98,279	–123,348	–45,523
Legislative Branch .....	3,719	3,804	0	624	–3,719	–3,180
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs .....	85,158	81,634	–2,170	16,515	–87,328	–65,119
Science-State-Justice-Commerce .....	57,453	58,856	0	23,080	–57,453	–35,776
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC .....	66,935	120,837	4,223	70,800	–62,712	–50,037
Unassigned .....	0	430	0	0	0	–430
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation) .....	843,020	916,836	21,289	395,452	–821,731	–521,384

STATEMENT OF FY2007 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER  
SECTION 401 OF H. CON. RES. 95

[Reflecting Action Completed as of July 8, 2005 in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority
Appropriate Level .....	23,158
Current Level:	
Elk Hills .....	0
Employment and Training Administration .....	0
Education for the Disadvantaged .....	0
School Improvement .....	0
Children and Family Services (Head Start) .....	0
Special Education .....	0
Vocational and Adult Education .....	0
Payment to Postal Service .....	0
Section 8 Renewals .....	0
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy .....	0
Total .....	0
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level .....	–23,158

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR JIM: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2006 budget and is current through July 8, 2005. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are ex-

empt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report).

Since my last letter, dated May 26, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed The TANF Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–19), which increases budget authority and outlays for 2006. In addition, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005 (S. 714).

The effects of the actions listed above are detailed in the enclosed report.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,  
*Director.*

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JULY 8, 2005

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: <sup>1</sup>			
Revenues .....	n.a.	n.a.	1,607,650
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	1,351,021	1,318,426	n.a.
Appropriation legislation .....	0	382,272	n.a.
Offsetting receipts .....	–479,872	–479,872	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions: .....	871,149	1,220,826	1,607,650
Enacted this session:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109–13) <sup>2</sup> .....	–39	–21	11
TANF Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–19) .....	148	165	0
Total, enacted this session .....	109	144	11
Passed, pending signature:			
Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005 (S. 714) .....	0	0	*
Entitlements and mandatories: Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted .....	449,701	424,094	n.a.
Total Current Level <sup>2,3</sup> .....	1,320,959	1,645,064	1,607,661
Total Budget Resolution .....	2,144,384	2,161,420	1,589,892
Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	17,769
Current Level Under Budget Resolution .....	823,425	516,356	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2006–2010:			
House Current Level .....	n.a.	n.a.	9,185,688
House Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	9,080,006



	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	105,682
Current Level Under Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law; \* = less than \$500,000.

<sup>1</sup> The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (P.L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to section 402 of H.Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$30,757 million in outlays from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13).

<sup>3</sup> Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today as part of the ongoing effort of myself and some of my colleagues in an endeavor we style the Iraq Watch. The Iraq Watch is a group of Members who are committed to the principle that we should not forget the Iraq war, a war started based on false information and based on the principle that Members of Congress owe it to the American citizens to continue our inquiry, to continue our critique, continue to review the operations of the administration in the initiation and the prosecution of the efforts in Iraq.

We do so because we have a heartfelt and deep belief that we owe this to our troops in the field who are performing with valor and distinction in Iraq; we owe it to American citizens whose sons and daughters and wives and husbands have been called away to Iraq; we owe it to those who believe that the prosecution of war should not result in the reduction of American civil liberties; and we do it in the name of those who believe that even during the fear and anxiety caused by war that we still as citizens must demand our elected officials recognize and respect basic matters of American democracy.

In these issues, the effort we have been involved with for over a year now about once every couple of weeks, we believe that the administration regrettably has fallen very, very short of what American citizens ought to demand of their Federal Government. So today, in a continuing series of the Iraq Watch, we intend to talk about several aspects leading up to the war and a matter that has now become of very great public interest.

If I may note, it is with great sadness I note the passing of an American Marine today in operations in Iraq, to add that proud Marine to the names of over 1,750 Americans who have lost their

lives in Iraq, the over 13,000 Americans who have had very serious injuries in Iraq and to those families who will not have their family members coming home. I know every Member of this Chamber of both parties, our thoughts, prayers and compassion are with every one of those families.

It is in part because of their continuing sacrifice in Iraq that we feel very strongly that Members of the House of Representatives have an obligation, a duty not to just let things slide by, to let this administration just sort of pass by unchallenged and uncriticized in the prosecution of this war. We believe this Chamber, which is the people's House, has an obligation to blow the whistle when things are done wrong, to force the administration to fess up to mistakes they have made, and to hopefully get back on track in this Nation where we are seriously off track at the moment.

What I would like to talk about in Iraq Watch today is a very serious issue that resulted in part on the initiation of this war, and that is that leading up to this war, the administration, the President of the United States, exercised their best efforts to convince Americans that Iraq had or was very close to developing a nuclear capacity and that this was a primary rationale for the President of the initiation of the war in Iraq.

Indeed, in the President's State of the Union address standing right behind me in this Chamber, the President of the United States addressed the joint session of Congress, the Supreme Court, the Joint Chiefs, members of the Cabinet, and most importantly the American people; and he told the American people that our intelligence services had learned that Iraq had in fact obtained what is called uranium yellow cake, and he told the American people that this was well established. This yellow cake is a mineral from which uranium fissionable material can be developed, it is a precursor to an atomic weapon, and its acquisition would be of concern to the American people.

The President told the American people that this was a fact, that there was no doubt about this fact and that as a result of that, he led this Nation, against many of our positions against the war, myself included, in a war based on what turned out to be false information. We know it is false information for two reasons: one, because we have now gone through the most exten-

sive search for weapons of mass destruction in human history in Iraq and found zero, zero yellow cake, zero precursors to nuclear weapons, zero triggering devices for nuclear weapons, zero indication that the things the President had told us were fact, in fact, turned out to be falsehoods and a war has resulted and 1,700 of our sons and daughters have paid the ultimate sacrifice in the sands of Iraq and that is continuing.

We had an earlier notice that this was false. The earlier notice we had was because the Central Intelligence Agency had concerns about this issue. Before the President's State of the Union address, they had received some suggestions that this was not fact and in fact was hyperbole at best and in fact that this claim about yellow cake may have been false.

So they dispatched a gentleman who had previously served with distinction in the Foreign Service, a gentleman named Joe Wilson, to Niger from which this yellow cake was supposedly obtained by Saddam Hussein, this brutal thug, this dictator who had caused so much damage in the world; and Joe Wilson, continuing in many of his patriotic duties, went to Niger to investigate this claim. What Mr. Wilson found was that this claim was, in laymen's terms, bogus. He came back to the United States and he reported to the agency that in fact this was a fraudulent claim, there was not a basis for it, it was highly unlikely that any such transaction took place and highly unlikely that Saddam Hussein had obtained yellow cake. He issued a written report in that regard, or a written report was generated from his report.

Yet despite the fact that an agent dispatched by our government went to Niger, the scene of this alleged crime, and reported back that this was a falsehood, the President of the United States told the American people that this was one basis that we had to send our sons and daughters into mortal combat in Iraq; and it was flat, plain false.

Why did that happen? Before I tell you a little bit about the story that occurred after that, I want to tell you just a little bit about Joe Wilson. Joe Wilson has served with distinction in the State Department. Joe Wilson is a guy who does not fit the mold of a person with sort of a pinstriped suit. He is a foreign diplomat who, to use the vernacular in the main street, has guts. Joe Wilson was the last American

State Department official out of Iraq before the Persian Gulf War; and he was responsible, according to the first President Bush who honored him for his work leading up to the first Persian Gulf war when he was stationed in Baghdad, he was honored for helping save scores of Americans to get them out of Baghdad before the first Persian Gulf war started because, as you recall, Saddam Hussein had threatened Americans, to kill them when the war started when they were still in Baghdad.

Saddam Hussein essentially threatened with death anyone who helped Americans get out of Baghdad before the first Persian Gulf war. Joe Wilson, who was sort of our agent in charge of the embassy in Baghdad then, went down and held a press conference with a rope around his neck and said, you can come get me first, Saddam, because I am taking my people home. That is exactly what he did. He faced down that brutal dictator at the cost potentially of his own life to help American lives.

It was interesting. I just met a woman by accident 2 weeks ago who served in the Foreign Service who told me that Joe once went, and just before the war, to take care of some children who had been moved back to Iraq from the United States, to try to save them before the war started at great risk to his own life. Joe Wilson is a guy with guts who stood up for American lives and did it when he went to Niger to report on this yellow cake, who reported accurately, who served his country; and the President of the United States, after he gave him the truth, got up, stood right there and told the American people that there was yellow cake from Niger and it was false. Joe Wilson is someone we owe a debt of gratitude to.

What has happened to Joe Wilson since he told the truth about the President's war in Iraq? Did this administration give accolades to this Joe Wilson the way the first President Bush did? No. Did they call him up and thank him for pointing out this error in the State of the Union address? No. Was a letter sent by the President of the United States to thank him for his courage in standing up to Saddam Hussein like the first President Bush did? No. Did the President of the United States or the State Department or Scott McClellan or anyone else thank Joe Wilson for his contribution for telling the truth to the American people? No.

What did this administration do to this citizen who shared the truth with the American people? It is a sad story, but I am going to share it with you and you know it. What they did was to go after his wife to try to damage her, to hurt her career, to punish Joe Wilson for pointing out the truth. We should expect any administration, Democrat, Republican or whatever party, to punish lies, not to punish the truth. But this administration punished a truth-teller and frankly an American, maybe

hero is too strong, but I think it approaches, a guy who showed some real courage under fire in Baghdad once before and in Niger a second time and they punished him. They punished him. They could not get to him, so they went after his wife.

I do not know what is a lower thing to do under the code of the West in American Western Civilization, to go after a truth-teller's wife, to punish them when he has told the truth and spoken the truth to power.

□ 1515

It is difficult to speak truth to power and Joe Wilson did it, and look at what he got as a result. What he got was essentially an outing of his wife who news reports suggest worked for the Central Intelligence Agency as a covert agent, an agent undercover, and what he got were press reports because of an administration we now know leaks intentional leaks to the media to disclose that Joe Wilson's wife worked for the Central Intelligence Agency.

What a "thank you" to an American who did something at the request of this administration. What a great note of appreciation to essentially, number one, destroy his wife's career because once one is outed in the CIA, of course, they cannot be a covert agent anymore, number one; number two, potentially jeopardize her safety when she has been a covert agent working on weapons of mass destruction issues; number three, jeopardize the people whom she worked with who now could be suspect in her covert operations; and, number four, damage the national security of the United States by compromising a CIA agent, which this administration did.

Now, who did this in this administration? There has been some suggestion about that. There has been some suggestion that one, at least of the administration people who did this, is the Deputy Chief of Staff of the White House, and that Deputy Chief of Staff, when questions were raised a long time ago about that, about whether the Deputy Chief of Staff had, in fact, disclosed this information, let us ask as Americans whether this administration upheld its obligation to us to tell the truth. We elect the President of the United States. It is an exalted and important position, but they do work for us, and they owe us the obligation of truth in matters of national security.

Let us find out what the President's officials and the administration officials told Americans about this subject in the last several years, whether the Deputy Chief of the White House was responsible for or involved in any way in this issue. We have a briefing on July 22, 2003, a briefing where Scott McClellan, who is the press secretary for the President, on July 22, 2003, in the White House, a question was asked: "Scott, has there ever been an attempt or effort on the part of anyone here at the White House to discredit the reputations or reporting of former Amba-

sador Joe Wilson, his wife, or ABC correspondent Jeffrey Kofman?"

McClellan: "John, I think I answered that yesterday. That is not the way that this White House operates. That's not the way the President operates. . . . No one would be authorized to do that within this White House. That is simply not the way we operate, and that's simply not the way the President operates."

We would like the administration not to operate that, to leak information about CIA agents, to punish somebody who told the truth. We will see a little later in this conversation whether they did.

July 23, 2003, answer by Mr. McClellan, when asked if Karl Rove did that, Mr. McClellan said, "I haven't heard that. That's just totally ridiculous. But we've already addressed this issue. I just said, it's totally ridiculous."

We go on to an interview with Mr. Rove on September 6, 2003, Andrea Owen of ABC asked Mr. Rove, "Did you have any knowledge or did you leak the name of a CIA agent to the press?"

Rove: "No."

September 29, 2003, again to Mr. McClellan: "Has the President either asked Karl Rove to assure him that he had nothing to do with this, or did Karl Rove go to the President to assure him that he . . ."

McClellan: "I don't think he needs that. I think I've spoken clearly to this publicly . . . I've just said there's no truth to it."

Question: "Yes. But I'm just wondering if there was a conversation between Karl Rove and the President or if he just talked to you and you're here at this . . ."

McClellan: "He wasn't involved. The President knows he wasn't involved."

Question: "How does he know that?"

McClellan: "The President knows."

We now have at least four instances where the President of the United States, through his spokesperson, has told us that the Deputy Chief of Staff was not involved in any way, in any way, at disclosing this information to destroy a CIA agent's career. But it is not just four times.

On September 29, 2003, question to Mr. McClellan: "Weeks ago, when you were first asked whether Mr. Rove had the conversation with Robert Novak that produced the column, you dismissed it as ridiculous. And I wanted just to make sure, at that time, had you talked to Karl?"

Answer by McClellan: "I've made it very clear from the beginning that it is totally ridiculous. I've known Karl for a long time, and I didn't even need to go ask Karl because I know the kind of person that he is, and he is someone that is committed to the highest standards of conduct."

A question to the President. Essentially people are starting to ask what will the President do when he finds out who leaked this information. Well, let us find out what the President said he would do.

On September 30, 2003, question: "Yesterday we were told that Karl Rove had no role in it . . ."

The President: "Yes."

Question: "Have you talked to Karl and do you have confidence in him . . ."

The President: "Listen, I know of nobody—I don't know of anybody in my administration who leaked classified information. If somebody did leak classified information, I'd like to know it, and we'll take the appropriate action."

October 1, McClellan: "The President doesn't condone the activity that you're suggesting, absolutely he does not."

October 7, and I will skip the question for a moment. McClellan: "I spoke with those individuals, as I pointed out, and those individuals assured me that they were not involved in this." And that included Karl Rove, Elliot Abrams, and Lewis Libby. "And that's where it stands."

Question: "So none of them told any reporter that Valerie Plame worked for the CIA?"

McClellan: "They assured me that they were not involved in this."

So the President subsequently said he would do what he should do if he found someone was involved in any way in leaking information. He said he would fire them. And when he was in Europe last week, when he was asked what he would do if he found that out, when asked if he would fire them, he said yes. So we have this situation where we now find, through hard evidence admitted by the lawyer for the Deputy Chief of Staff, that, in fact, Mr. Rove told Mr. Cooper, a news reporter, that, in fact, he told him that Joe Wilson's wife worked through for the Central Intelligence Agency.

And for 2 years now, the official position of the President of the United States telling the American people has said, My Deputy Chief of Staff had nothing to do with this, never mentioned it, never leaked a word, never hushed it, never gave an inclination about it, totally ridiculous. And now we know the sordid truth. And it is sordid. It is sad. We should be talking about some other things here rather than this. But we believe that the truth is important to the American people.

Americans deserve the truth. They deserve not to have an administration to punish Americans who stand up against power, and that is what they did.

We now find phase one a failure of the administration to hush this up and bury this story. They denied it for 2 years. They said it was ridiculous for 2 years. They tried to suppress this information for 2 years. They refused to be candid with the American people for 2 years, and that approach has failed. So what approach are they now using to try to wiggle out from this most terrible abuse of our national security? Let us go through their sort of defenses now.

By the way, it is interesting the White House now refuses to comment on this. That has not stopped the majority party talk machine from launching an all-out offensive against Mr. Wilson today. We can read—they're still defaming Mr. Wilson today. They still have not given up thinking that if they can destroy Mr. Wilson that we will forget about the falsehood that the President used in starting this war. We are not going to forget because this really is not about Mr. Wilson. It is about our sons and daughters in Iraq. And it is about American democracy and our right to have the President tell us the truth. And we are not going to forget.

So let us see what strategies they are using now rather than just suppressing the truth. They are using the strategy that Mr. Rove did not use the name Valerie Plame. All he said was it was Joe Wilson's wife who worked at the Central Intelligence Agency; therefore, they think no harm, no foul. Whom do the Members think they are identifying if not Valerie Plame? Unless Karl Rove thought that Joe Wilson was a polygamist, had ten wives so we could not tell which one it was, it is pretty clear whom he was identifying.

Just like I started this Special Order today and I made reference to the Deputy Chief of Staff at the White House, everyone knew whom I was talking about. I did not use his name, but we know who it was. That dog just will not hunt. It is embarrassing. It is embarrassing to try to fall back on that as some excuse for violating the security laws of the United States. So that one will not work.

Second, they argued that, well, it was unintentional, did not really intend to do this. That might be because we all make mistakes, we all make misstatements, we all misspeak on occasion, myself included. Perhaps we should just forgive and forget that. Except for one thing. It is clear it was not. It is clear it was not a simple accident. The reason we know it was not a simple accident is for 2 years they covered up the truth of what happened. When people act guilty and suppress the truth, frequently it means they were guilty. And this was not innocent conduct where for 2 years the White House was saying it was ridiculous that Karl Rove would be involved in this, ridiculous. I actually think it is ridiculous now that they are not taking responsibility and being accountable. We should not have to be arguing about this right now.

They say that they were just explaining, they were just explaining how Mr. Wilson happened to be in Niger. Mr. Rove could have just explained very easily by saying some people close to Mr. Wilson knew him and wanted to send him to Niger. That could have preserved the cover of this CIA agent, and there would have been no problem.

So what we are seeing is a collapse of excuses. This is a collapse of a fabricated effort to protect the Deputy

Chief of Staff, which I understand. The Deputy Chief of Staff has been a loyal lieutenant and adviser to the President of the United States, and we can all, to some degree, respect loyalty. But when it comes down to a situation where the President is forced, through his spokesperson, to continue to not tell the truth to the American people, as it has happened here, it is unhealthy for the administration. It is unhealthy for America, and this boil needs to get lanced. It needs to get resolved. We cannot go on with this cloud hanging over the country. It needs resolution.

That is why in the next few days, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and myself and other Members will offer a resolution of inquiry calling on the U.S. House of Representatives to get to the bottom of what happened in this situation. And this is a very simple thing that will simply request, actually require, the administration to provide answers to the American people of what happened here once and for all. We need to get this resolved and behind us. We need to find a way, a bipartisan way, to bring our troops home; to find some way to leave Iraq a stable place and bring our troops home. And we need to be involved in a bipartisan attempt to do this rather than arguing about this situation.

But until the administration is candid with the American people and we know why an administration punished an American citizen for, number one, going to Niger as requested by the CIA; telling the truth to the administration, number two; three, having the courage to tell the public about it after the President stated a falsehood during his State of the Union address; and fourth, refusing to be intimidated, and I respect people who are not intimidated by power.

□ 1530

Joe Wilson is not intimidated by power. He was not intimidated in Baghdad, and he is not intimidated now. We will not be intimidated to get to the bottom of this sordid affair. That is why we hope that on a bipartisan basis we will pass a resolution of inquiry calling to get answers to what happened in this sorry situation. Americans deserve it. It will help us move forward to get to the issues that we need to do.

Now, let me also talk about why perhaps, today and the last 2 days, if you have happened to watch the press conferences at the White House, you have noticed Mr. McClellan has been besieged by people who wanted to provide Americans the truth as we now know it about what actually happened here. Now, after telling us for 2 years, being quite willing to talk about this, saying this is ridiculous, this was just a fishing expedition, and that we should not bother with those little people over there in the corner who want to know the truth about this, now, all of a sudden, Mr. McClellan does not want to talk about this anymore. Why is that?

You have to ask yourself why, after being so loquacious about this for 2 years, now they do not want to talk about it. Well, I think it is understandable when you think about it.

Think about this: Mr. McClellan told the American people that the President knows that the Deputy Chief of Staff was not involved in this, that it was ridiculous. The Deputy Chief of Staff says, no, I was not involved in this. The President of the United States says, no, he was not involved in this, and people who were, we would fire them.

Now, you take those three individuals, somebody is not telling the truth. Somebody is not being entirely candid with the American people. The Deputy Chief of Staff is not being candid with the President, perhaps, or the Deputy Chief of Staff is not being candid with the press secretary, perhaps, or the press secretary is not being candid with the American people, perhaps. There is a third possibility, and I am not even going to suggest it on the floor of this House. But somebody is not being candid with the American people about why an American was punished for doing his duty when he was asked to go to Niger.

I mean, you think about that. You imagine if the Federal Government tomorrow called you and said, I have this tough task. I want you to go to Africa where it is dusty and hot and a big day is when you get some sugar in your tea, and I want you to find out if there is yellow cake there because we are trying to decide whether to start a war or not. It is a big, big deal. And you go there, essentially out of retirement, and you bring back the truthful answer, and you give it to the administration. They then ignore your conclusion and put it in the State of the Union address anyway, a war is talked about to be started; you have the guts enough to write an op-ed in *The New York Times* telling America what you concluded, and, all of a sudden, the entire Federal Government comes after you and destroys your wife's career. That should not happen to any American of any political persuasion. And that principle is an important one.

This is not the only time this has happened in America. You recall back in the Vietnam era where there was an author who was critical of President Nixon's war in Vietnam, Daniel Ellsberg; and he published in *The New York Times* some information that was critical of the President. So what did the President do? Did he thank him for sharing this information with the public? No. He had people burglarize Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office in order to get information to destroy Daniel Ellsberg's credibility. That President tried to destroy their critic's credibility, and that is what happened here. A different way, a different strategy, a different effort, same goal: punish critics of the administration.

We went through a Revolutionary War to get rid of King George because we believed citizens rule the country

and when citizens exercise their right of free speech and they tell the truth, nobody here in Washington, D.C. ought to be able to punish them. It was a principle worth going to the Revolutionary War about it. And in a small way, we are fighting it right here: that if you are a citizen and you tell the truth, nobody should be able to punish you, even the most powerful person in America. That is why we are filing this resolution of inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), who has provided great leadership and who was working on this subject last year to try to bring to the attention of the country this issue. He has shown a lot of courage on this. I thank the gentleman for joining us today.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from Washington, for this Special Order and for shining a light on this subject. The gentleman is right, this is something, it is curious. I have been trying for a couple of years to draw sharp attention to this, to this exposure of the identity of someone whom we have asked to undertake risky, dangerous, important assignments for quite a long time.

The press seemed very interested in this other issue of their ability to protect their sources, not an unimportant issue, but something apart from this critical issue of how we as a country collect intelligence, what we as a country ask of people who risk their lives to collect that intelligence, and what we do about protecting their ability to do it and protecting their lives and welfare.

This is a very important matter. Former President Bush, the current President's father, said that those who expose our human sources are "the most insidious of traitors." Ten former intelligence officers signed a letter calling the disclosure of this particular officer's identity "a shameful and unprecedented event in American history." It is an uncommon occurrence, and for good reason. Thank goodness, it is uncommon.

Intelligence is intended to save lives. Intelligence is intended to protect our national security. Intelligence is intended to be something that prevents us from going to war. But to collect that intelligence, people have to take great risks. Operating undercover, perhaps under an alias, dealing with people in out-of-the-way places is often a thankless job. We do not often acknowledge the people who do that. It is a terrible thing when their effectiveness is lost through some accident. It is even worse when they are exposed by the counterintelligence people in another country.

But worst of all, of almost unthinkable tragedy, is when a person would be exposed by his or her own government. Mr. Speaker, it is not just a matter of ruining a career, it is not just a matter of an affront to a person or her spouse, it is not just the loss of probably mil-

lions of dollars that goes into developing an undercover agent, providing the cover and all that.

No, it is more than the ruined career, more than the loss to our Nation of effective intelligence. It actually puts that person at risk. And anyone who ever had lunch with that person in a foreign country is now suspected by that country as having been fraternizing with a spy. We do not know what has happened to other people in other countries because of exposure of identities of intelligence officers. That an exposure should come from our own country is almost unthinkable.

So when we raise this subject today, it is not about political "gotcha"; it is not to embarrass someone. No. It is because we as a Congress have a responsibility to look after these people whom we have asked to take great risks. And we have to make sure that this sort of thing does not happen. That is why we want to know what happened and how it happened. It is, well, like someone sending an e-mail to the enemy with a position of our troops on the map. You do not do that at wartime. That is treasonous.

Today, the members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on which I sit submitted a letter to the President, again underscoring the importance of this matter, abhorring the disclosure of identities of undercover officers, and asking that the President take the step of removing the security clearance from anyone known to have any association with this. We certainly know that Karl Rove, as acknowledged through his attorney, that he disclosed the identity, maybe not by name, but he might as well have; the identity of an intelligence officer to a reporter of a national news magazine.

Because the officer was undercover, her identity could be known only through access to classified information. There is ample precedent for suspending the security clearances of people under suspicion of leaking classified information. So we formally and soberly asked the President to suspend any and all of Mr. Rove's security clearances, at least and until the Fitzgerald investigation is complete. That is just one step.

But we here in Congress have an important role beyond that, a role of oversight to make sure that we, as I say, look after the welfare, effectiveness, and safety of those whom we have asked to take risks for our country so that we can know what is going on around the world, so we can avoid war, so that we can save lives, so that we can advance democracy.

I thank my colleague from Washington for this Special Order; and I hope, now that the country's attention is focused on this subject, that we really can get to the bottom of it. The President said at first that he would find and fire this person. Then a little bit later he said, you know, it is going to be really hard to find the person.

This is the same President who said we will find Osama bin Laden, wherever he is in the world. But among the 5,000 people in the White House, I am going to have a hard time finding out who it was who leaked this. Well, we know at least one person in the White House now who was party to this. The President should take action so that this sort of thing will never happen again.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I have to say, one of the troublesome things to me now that this disclosure has come up, here the person, at least one, there might be more people who are responsible for this besides the Deputy Chief of Staff; there may be more than one, but at least one was a person who talks to the President at least several times a day. I cannot understand when this came out why the President did not demand his inner circle to give him an affidavit saying they were not involved in this, and get to the heart of this.

Instead, the President of the United States, who works across the desk from the gentleman who is at least one of the people responsible for this leak, the most powerful man in the world could not get a straight answer. Now, if he did not get a straight answer on this important thing, then the President should exercise what he promised the American people he would do, which is to send that person on to other pursuits, and we will see whether the President meant what he said in that regard shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and mention one other thing and ask for his response. There is one other excuse that we are hearing floated about this today, and I have heard some people defending the White House saying, well, this was not really that big of a deal. We might have said there was yellow cake in there anyway, because we really did not know; we would have thrown that up in the State of the Union address anyway.

□ 1545

So no harm, no foul. I want to read something that Secretary of State Rice said on July 26, 2003, "My only point is that in retrospect, knowing that some of the documents underneath may have been, were indeed forgeries, and knowing that apparently there were concerns swirling around about this, had we known that at the time, we would not have put it in. And if there had been even a peep that the Agency did not want that sentence, or that George Tenet did not want that sentence in, that the Director of Central Intelligence did not want it in, it would not have been done."

Here we have the person sent by the CIA to get this information, reported back these were forgeries, reporting back it is highly unlikely there is yellow cake there, but the President put it in anyway, and then Secretary Rice was candid.

She said we should not have put that in. So let us not let this sort of octopus

defense of squirting ink around this thing obscure a central truth. The President gave false information to the American people, and for one reason or the another did not report what his own agent, the CIA, had sent, and then his administration punished that person.

This cries out for action by Congress.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would say this goes beyond political punishment. We certainly could condemn his punishing the envoy who went to learn the truth about the uranium from Niger. But for whatever reason to disclose the identity of someone whom we have asked to take risks, life and death risks on our behalf is almost unthinkable.

And to do it for what appear to be gratuitous political reasons makes it all the more shameful.

Mr. INSLEE. Would it be fair to say that if these assertions are true, someone put political convenience ahead of national security? I will make that a rhetorical question.

Mr. HOLT. I cannot imagine why this name would have been released, but for the sake of creating political embarrassment for someone. I call that a gratuitous breach of national security.

There does not seem to be any higher purpose here. I suppose you might be able to imagine some circumstances where for some higher purpose you probably could dream up something where releasing the identity of, you know, someone we have put in such a dangerous position might be justifiable, but this certainly is not it.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, we would stand for the proposition that political pettiness does not justify a breach of national security. I hope we can have bipartisan consensus on that.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) for bringing this issue to the floor of the House. I think it is at the moment one of the most important issues that this Congress should be dealing with, but is not doing so.

As you pointed out, there is a great deal of dissembling going on within the context of the Bush Administration. And one of the principal people responsible for that is Mr. Rove. It is quite clear that he revealed the identity of Valerie Plame, Central Intelligence Agency operative, and the wife of Ambassador Wilson, to at least one reporter, in this particular case a reporter for Time Magazine, and that he did so in the context of e-mail.

But it is also very likely that he made that revelation not just to the reporter for Time Magazine, but to others as well. And it may very well have been Mr. Rove who made that revelation to Robert Novak, who was the columnist who published her name and made the revelation that someone working for the intelligence agency in a very sensitive position now had that

name made public, putting that person in danger.

So the question of the motivation here is one that is very important. It is quite clear that at least on one level, the motivation was to exact retribution against Ambassador Wilson, who you have pointed out rightly was sent by the Central Intelligence Agency to Niger to investigate the question as to whether or not enriched yellow cake uranium was being transported from Niger into Iraq.

The President of the United States in this room, in an address to a joint session of the Congress of the United States, and to the American people, made the assertion that enriched yellow cake uranium was being imported from Niger into Iraq, and that created the prospect that Iraq was developing nuclear weapons.

On numerous occasions, the President, the Vice President, the National Security Advisor, and others in the administration, used the illustration of the mushroom cloud in reference to Iraq, to create the impression that Iraq was developing a nuclear weapon.

Ambassador Wilson, in the context of his trip to Niger, made it very clear that no yellow cake uranium had been transported from Niger to Iraq. Nevertheless, the administration continued to allege that that is not the case, and that Iraq was engaged in a program to develop a nuclear weapon.

So what we see here in the course of this discussion this afternoon is another example of the dissembling, the misuse of information by important people within this administration. And from our point of view, as Members of the House of Representatives, one of the critical aspects of all of this is the failure of this House to address this circumstance.

We know that the allegations made by the administration with regard to the connection between Iraq and the attack of September 11 were untrue. We know that the allegations concerning the relationship between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden were not true. We know that the allegations with regard to weapons of mass destruction, including the prospects of a nuclear weapon, were untrue.

Why is it that this House of Representatives is not carrying out its responsibilities under the Constitution to conduct an investigation and to hold Congressional hearings with regard to this issue?

Mr. INSLEE. I think you bring a very good point about Congress's obligation to investigate the executive branch. We do have a checks-and-balances system here. I think that is very important in this case, because essentially the President has said, as he said yesterday, look, this is a criminal investigation, so I have no responsibility whatsoever, he implied this, to find out what happened here.

He says, you know, there is a prosecutor here, so I have no responsibility to find out if people who work literally

in my office had outed a security agent for punishment for someone telling the truth.

Whether there was a crime or not, any President, and this President has said so, should fire a person who discloses secret information of a covert agent's identity in part to punish a person who told the truth in criticizing the administration.

Even if that is not a crime, it is a crime against the code of the west and the expectations of millions of Americans, where we do not allow our elected officials to punish us for criticizing the administration. We do not allow a President's agents to jeopardize a man's wife who is a secret agent, and expose their two young children, and this couple have two of the most delightful young children that you will ever meet in your life, and you can assume that this covert agent for the CIA mother has the same concerns about her children that you would when you are a covert agent and someone has blown your cover, and then they attack Mr. Wilson's wife.

The President has an obligation that goes beyond simply upholding this felony laws of America. His obligation to Americans is greater than that. And he ought to call these people in and say, did you have anything to do with this? And if they did, he needs to make a decision about their continued employment. And yet he refuses to do that. That is most troublesome. You know, there are fifth amendment privileges. There are all of these little technicalities in the law. This is not a technicality, we are standing up for the proposition that Americans should not be abused in this regard.

We are running out of time. I want to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to very briefly take this to another level. And it is about truth and trust. I, as a former ambassador representing the United States of America, was trained in the State Department as to confidentiality and secret missions that were taking place around this globe. The audacity of someone in the Executive Branch even making reference to a covert agent violates that confidentiality and puts us all at risk.

It is not something you play with. It is not something you use for retaliation. When you out an agent, you are outing all of us.

Our intelligence functions on us having operatives in places where people are plotting against our Nation. Our defense will be in the fact that they bring that information to us and we prepare our defenses.

If these people are exposed, they no longer can gather the information that can save lives and property. So I think this is the most heinous act. I am not even going to get into the debate whether it is prosecutable or not. But, any leader in the executive branch ought to understand that you cannot have people there who will leak this in-

formation. The safety of all of our citizens depends on the confidentiality.

Mr. INSLEE. I think the Congresswoman has brought up another point, and that is, the nature of this agent who is a covert agent operating under cover for her own protection, and those people, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) indicated, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) indicated, the people that she worked with, the people that she had lunch with in various countries around the world are now suspect.

But it was interesting in the litany of excuses for this misconduct that we have heard out of the White House for the last few days or at least their operatives around the country, one of the excuses I have heard is that the deputy chief of staff, Mr. Rove, did not know that this CIA agent was a covert agent. He just did not know that.

And, therefore, he wants to excuse that misbehavior since he did not know she was covert. Maybe she could have been just a receptionist at the front desk. There is a problem with that. When you out a CIA agent, you darn well better know whether they are covert or not before you violate your security clearance in outing that CIA agent.

And unless we hear a real good reason that Mr. Rove asked the CIA and was told inappropriately or something, there is no excuse for someone in the highest levels of government, with supposedly the sophistication working at the right hand of the President of the United States, not to know you did not out a CIA agent knowing they could be covert.

The damage that has been done here to our security, to Joe Wilson's spouse, to our trust in the Federal Government, was occasioned, regardless of the intention of the deputy chief of staff, one way or another there has been an abuse of both the family and our sense of national security.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that a deputy chief of staff in the White House to even mention the name of Ambassador Wilson, not naming his wife would not know, because she is the one that sent him over there to Niger.

□ 1600

So how did Robert Novak get the information to print her name in the press? So I do not buy the excuses. I do not think the American people, knowing the truth, will buy the excuses. What we have all lost is the faith and the trust in this administration to deal straightforwardly with the American people, and as the gentleman has so brilliantly enumerated all the other misinformation activities involving this administration. We must stop it and we must stop it now because the reputation of the United States has sunk to its lowest point.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for joining me.

I would like to conclude with a couple of comments. This is the greatest

Nation on Earth, and it is the greatest because it works on a principle that our citizens should be in control of our democracy, not people in power.

It works on the assumption that that power will not be abused. It works on the principle that our elected officials will tell us the truth. It works on the principles that people's wives should not be attacked when a person fulfills their patriotic duty to go to Africa and ferret out the truth.

It works on the principle that people are human and they can make mistakes; but when they make mistakes, they ought to be candid and forthright with Americans. And the sooner the President of the United States is forthright and tells us what happened in this situation, the better off both for the White House and for us as a whole. And if it refuses to do that, which it is now stonewalling in its finest tradition of those who were caught red-handed, it is refusing to give Americans information.

That is why this House of Representatives needs to pass this resolution of inquiry so that we can have a bipartisan review of what happened here. Why? So that we can regain the bipartisan trust we need to go forward with and deal with our pressing problems in Iraq, our pressing problems with the threat of terrorism, and we can get back on track in this government.

Before I close, I want to thank the Wilson family for their courage in going to Africa. I want to thank Mrs. Wilson for her courage as an employee of the CIA. I want to thank them for their courage in standing up to the administration that has so willfully abused them. And I hope that the truth that they have worked so hard to bring to the American people will ultimately prevail in this affair.

#### HONORING RICHARD LEE WILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Miss McMORRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. I rise today to honor Richard Lee Wiles, my friend, my former economic development and technical education coordinator, and a man who was as brilliant and far-sighted as he was straightforward and unpretentious; the kind of man who brought dignity and integrity and a great deal of expertise to everything he did in life.

I am sad to report that late in June, Richard, or Dick as he was known to friends and strangers alike, passed away while conducting his duties on behalf of people of the 5th district of Pennsylvania.

Dick was more than an employee. He was a true friend and a loyal confidant. Dick graduated in 1958 from East Brady High School and in 1963 from Penn State University where he received a



bachelor's degree in agriculture and later a master's degree in communication.

For many years he operated Nova Productions, a public relations firm that was very successful. But, Madam Speaker, more than just a knowledgeable counselor and an able communicator, Dick Wiles was truly a renaissance man. Evidence of this can be seen during his high school and college years when to pay for his education, Dick started and was an active member in a well known dance band, The Rhythm Knights.

Indeed, he was a gentleman of the highest order who could cook, sing, fish, hunt, dance, paint, write poetry and prose, and charm everyone present within the sound of his voice. I used to joke that his charm almost earned him a seat in the Pennsylvania General Assembly over 25 years ago when he came within a few hundred votes of defeating a long-term popular incumbent, despite receiving absolutely no support, financial or otherwise, from the party structure or apparatus.

Madam Speaker, Dick Wiles was one of the most politically savvy and intelligent, gifted people I have ever met. What made him special, though, was how he selflessly used his talent to serve his neighbors and better his community. More than once Dick told me that he loved his job so much that he felt guilty for receiving a pay check.

But more than a humble public servant, Dick will be remembered as a humble servant of God, a man who deeply cared about the condition of his country; a husband who cherished his beautiful wife, Barbara; a father who loved his wonderful daughters, Julia and Jennifer; a grandfather who pampered his four lovely grandchildren, Seanna, Taylor, Alex and Colin; and was fond and took great care of his sister-in-law, Debbie, and her son, Ricky; a friend who reminded us all of what could be accomplished with a little hard work, gritty determination and general good will towards his fellow man.

He was one of the finest conversationalists I have met and one of the most inquiring minds I ever dealt with. His interests were broad. His memory was phenomenal.

Two years ago, Dick lost his lovely wife, Barb, unexpectedly. Since then he lived alone in east Brady and was very lonely. I knew that and I always had chatted with him often and always enjoyed those conversations, but I made it a habit to call him numerous times per day. I talked to him several times daily. I would call him on my way to the Capitol for a vote. I would call him in my apartment in the evenings. We would have lengthy chats. I would call him when I was traveling in my district at home because I have a large rural district. I enjoyed those visits I think more than he because he gave so much.

Madam Speaker, Dick was a phenomenal leader on several issues. He

helped me develop technical education in the 5th district by helping equip our high schools with the newest, latest technology, and bringing technical schools and community colleges to help train our adults for the skilled technical jobs that are vital in today's high-tech economy. That was an education that we lacked.

He also was my staff person who was my specialist to help promote tourism in the 5th district. He was my steady voice on Governor Rendell's Pennsylvania Wilds Working Group, a group joining 13 counties together in beautiful north central Pennsylvania to develop our tourism potential, an area rich in natural beauty, historic sites and scenic Route 6, Pennsylvania's elk herd, Kinzua Lake and the Allegheny National Forest.

Dick truly loved his work and he was so good at it. He truly adored his family, his community, his State and his country. He was always a gentleman.

Dick, we really miss you.

Madam Speaker, I humbly submit these comments to the RECORD, and I humbly commit his spirit to the communion of saints above. May Dick rest in peace.

#### REFORMING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to engage, I hope, in a discussion with my colleagues about an important issue confronting our country, and it is an issue on which we have already begun a national dialogue. It is an issue that, at least before the last few months, was an issue of bipartisan concern, and that is reforming Social Security.

As you know, Madam Speaker, the former President of this Nation, Bill Clinton, raised this issue during his tenure in office and noted that the Social Security program in its current structure is in trouble and in need of reform. It is facing several serious problems.

One of them is the solvency of the program over time. And another is its fairness to the younger generations. There is a new idea here in Washington and a simple idea that has surfaced just within the last few weeks on Social Security reform that does not solve the entire problem in one fell swoop, but would start us on a path and would address the most egregious problem of all, and that is the structure of Social Security which simply is unsustainable in its current form. So I want to focus this discussion this afternoon largely on that new idea.

It is an idea that responds as the House should respond to the concerns and the interests of the American people about what is happening with their Social Security taxes, their payroll

taxes. Let me begin with some of the basics.

As I think all Americans understand on both sides of the aisle, the Social Security system as it is structured today is a pay-as-you-go system. It is a system where those of us working today in the workforce pay in our payroll taxes and those payroll taxes by and large immediately go out the door to pay the retirement benefits of the Americans who are retired today. That is the structure of the current system, and that is the structure that many countries around the world created some 35 to 40 to 50 years ago.

Germany, I think, was first to substitute a Social Security program for its elderly based on this premise, that is, that we would tax workers to pay retirement benefits for those retired. There was nothing wrong with that proposal when initiated because at that time the workforce was dramatically larger than those who were on retirement. Indeed, I think most Americans now know that in 1935 when Social Security was created, there were some 42 Americans working for every American collecting retirement benefits. Clearly, 42 workers can, through their payroll taxes, support one retiree. But as most Americans know by today, those numbers have changed dramatically.

In the 1950s, it went to where we had roughly 15 or 16 workers per retiree. Again, that was sustainable. But now we face a new problem. The reality is that the workforce relative to the number of people retired has shrunk and today in America there are only 3.3 working Americans paying payroll taxes to support each individual currently retired and collecting Social Security taxes. If the trends continues, and it will, that is unsustainable. Very soon we will be down to where there are two workers and even less than two workers paying Social Security taxes, payroll taxes to support each retiree. That simply cannot be sustained over time. And so we have a problem with the structure of Social Security. We also have a problem with its long-term solvency. And, most importantly, I think we have a problem with what is referred to as generational fairness.

We all know that solvency is the issue of whether or not we have the money set aside to pay the benefits we have promised, and in point of fact we do not. While the system runs a short-term surplus today, we collect more in Social Security taxes than we pay out today in Social Security benefits. That short-term Social Security surplus of revenues in over benefits paid out will end as soon as 2017. Indeed, the surplus itself will begin to shrink, that is go down, year to year as early as 2008.

So this is a problem that confronts us very soon, and as the actuaries have told us and as I think Americans understand, the trust fund which we would have to begin drawing upon in 2017 to pay the promised benefit will itself be depleted by 2042. Thus, we have a long-term solvency problem

with the current structure where we have a shrinking number of workers per retiree.

But the other issue that is not discussed very often is the issue of generational fairness. Generational fairness is a term I use, and I think most Americans and my colleagues understand it, but then when I talk to an audience they say they do not understand it so let me try to make that point clear. Solvency is one issue, but generational fairness is a separate issue. As it turns out under the Social Security system that we have today in America, my grandparents, most Americans' grandparents, collected an effective rate of return on the Social Security taxes they paid, that is, on the payroll taxes they have paid into Social Security, when they collected their benefits, on average they got a rate of return on the money they had put in of about 5 percent.

Now, 5 percent is not a great rate of return. You and I would like to be able to invest our money and get 8 or 10 or a better rate of return on the money we invest; but for a program which is designed as this program is designed to provide a floor of protection for those Americans who have either not been able to or have not, in fact, set aside money for their retirement, if you got a rate of return on the money you put into Social Security of 5 percent, you were doing fairly well.

□ 1615

That is a decent rate of return. But because of the current structure of Social Security, that is not continuing. Indeed, our children, my children and my grandchildren, will get a rate of return of less than 1.6 percent; and, indeed, for many of them, their rate of return will be negative, that is, they will pay in more in social security taxes than they collect in their lifetimes, on average, in Social Security benefits. That is generational fairness, and it is simply not fair.

I think most Americans would agree that creating Social Security, the Social Security program we have, creating a floor of protection so that all Americans can enjoy their retirement years, safe in knowing that they have money to pay for their groceries and to pay their rent is a laudable goal, and with a rate of return of 5 percent on your money, you can do that. But with a rate of return of 1.6 percent or less, or a negative rate of return, our children and our grandchildren, if we do not make changes, will in fact not have a secure retirement. Indeed, they will not have the funds when they go to retire to even minimally get by.

Now, those are the basics that have been involved in this debate from the outset, and there are lots of ideas on the table. President Bush has put ideas on the table to deal with both the issue of solvency and the issue of generational fairness so that we can make the program financially sound for the future. Indeed, he would like to

make it financially sound forever, not just for the 75-year horizon that the Social Security trustees base their analysis on. But also he would like to make sure that we guarantee the next generation as secure a retirement as this generation has had and as the last generation had.

Now, I know a lot of Americans glaze over and say, wow, I have heard so many different ideas on Social Security and on Social Security reform that I get confused. People talk to me about personal accounts. People talk to me about benefit cuts. People talk to me about increases in taxes. I want to talk about a new idea, a new idea which can solve a part of the Social Security problem and stop a practice which is offensive and a bad idea.

When I went home and did my town halls with my constituents in Phoenix, AZ, discussing the issue of Social Security, I had to explain to my constituents this short-term surplus that we have. That is the fact that today, and every year since 1983, we have been collecting more in Social Security revenues than we are paying out in benefits. So we have a surplus. And I had to explain to my constituents, as my colleagues here in the Congress have had to do, that that excess money is not being set aside for Social Security.

Indeed, the Social Security surplus that Americans are paying in collectively through their payroll taxes, that is the money in excess of the amount spent today for those retired today, is being, I would say quite frankly, misappropriated by the Congress of the United States and the Federal Government. Because when Americans pay payroll taxes to fund the Social Security program, they believe, and they have an absolute right to believe, that their money, paid as payroll taxes to fund Social Security, should be and is being used for Social Security. But that is not true today, and it has not been true since 1983.

That money, this short-term surplus of Social Security revenues or Social Security benefits paid out, is in fact taken each year by the United States Congress and spent for general government purposes. It is spent to fund the Department of Agriculture. It is spent to fund the Department of Defense. It is spent to fund the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is spent all over this government for general purposes having nothing to do with Social Security. And I will tell you, my constituents, when they learn that, are angry.

Now, I mentioned a moment ago that there are many ideas for reforming Social Security. And some back home say, Congressman, it is all too confusing to me. I do not understand. That is the central key element of this new idea. When I went home and when my colleagues went home to address the issue of Social Security reform, and when the American people understood that we are misappropriating the Social Security surplus to things other

than Social Security, they got angry; and they said, well, I do not care how and I do not understand how you reform the entire Social Security program, but the one thing you better do, Congressman, the one thing you owe to us, the American people, the one thing you owe to every single person collecting Social Security and every single person paying social security taxes is to stop stealing, stop raiding the Social Security surplus, those payroll taxes paid in for our future retirement, and using them for general government purposes. And that is precisely what this new idea does.

A colleague of mine in the Senate, JIM DEMINT, first elected to the House and served with me here in the House, has dropped a piece of legislation, and I and a group of members on the Ways and Means Committee in the House have dropped a piece of legislation that will do precisely that. It will take, from the moment it is enacted through a 10-year period, from roughly today through 2017, the Social Security surplus that comes in and it will stop spending that money on anything other than Social Security. Now, how do we do that?

What we will do is allocate that surplus to every single American who is paying payroll taxes under the age of 55, and we will set up an account in their name and we will put that money in that account. Now, for the first 3 years, the accounts will be invested in U.S. Treasury bonds, the safest investment in the world and the same kind of investment where your social security taxes are being invested today.

But the key difference, the critical difference is that we will stop using that money for general government purposes, we will stop using it to hide the real deficit and the real debt, and we will allocate it to Social Security.

Talk about a simple notion. I, an American taxpayer, Joe Smith in my district, an American taxpayer who works at a job and pays payroll taxes, he may be one of those American taxpayers who pays more in payroll taxes than in income taxes. We are going to say to him, Beginning with the passage of this bill, which is called the GROW Act, we will make sure that every single dime you pay in payroll taxes to fund the Social Security System goes to Social Security.

Now, a portion of it will go to current retirees, but the rest will no longer be spent for Forest Service pick-up trucks or for national defense or for welfare benefits, or for any other purpose than Social Security. And the way we will do that is to put it into an account in your name.

I think that is a simple, straightforward basic idea that the American people can address and they can understand, because it is not complicated, and they can embrace and say, well, if we cannot fix all the problems with Social Security, we ought to at least get started. And I am extremely excited and encouraged that this simple notion

of taking the Social Security surplus that we will have for the next decade and locking it away in individual, and use the overused term lockboxes, in the name of each American taxpayer so that we do not spend it on any other purpose, I think, is a great idea whose time has come.

By the way, these will be individual accounts. They will be in the name of each payroll taxpayer. They will be inheritable. It will be their money. Indeed, just to show you how different it is than the current system: under the current system, if you pay payroll taxes this year, and you pass away 2 years from now, and you are under the age of 65, that money that you paid in goes away. It is lost forever.

If we enact this simple bill, locking away just the Social Security surplus, and you work for 2 more years after the program goes into effect and then you pass away, still under the age of 65, instead of getting nothing, your spouse or your children or your grandchildren will inherit every dime of that money. It is your money; and when you pass away, it becomes their money.

This is not a gimmick. This is not a paper scheme. This is not a ledger entry here in Washington that never matters. This is hard, cold cash in the pockets of your children or your grandchildren beginning to accumulate the day this legislation takes effect.

There are lots of other good things to say about it, but I have been joined by my colleague from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), and I have talked fairly long about this topic for a moment so maybe I will let him chime in and vary the discussion a little bit.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I especially appreciate his leadership on this issue. Tens of millions of Americans, future generations, are going to have their retirement security threatened unless we do something and do something today. Every day that we postpone trying to help save and reform Social Security it is costing us an extra \$200 million. The time to act is now.

Madam Speaker, for me this is much more than one's average congressional debate. This is something I take very, very seriously and very personally. I take it personally because my parents are in their 70s. Now, Social Security is an important part of their retirement security. They worked very hard their whole lives to earn that Social Security, and nobody has a plan that will take their Social Security away. As their son, as a Congressman, I am dedicated to making sure that my parents and every one of that generation gets every penny of Social Security that they have earned. I have a sacred obligation to my parents.

I have another sacred obligation. I have a 3½-year-old daughter and a 22-month-old son. And if we do not do something and do something today, Social Security as we know it will not be there for my children. We are rapidly

approaching the point where we are going to lose the security from Social Security.

My colleague from Arizona, who is a great leader on this issue, and everyone should appreciate his helping coauthor the GROW account legislation, he very ably laid out for the American people, Madam Speaker, the challenges we are facing in Social Security. As much as Congress would like to, we cannot repeal the laws of demographics. So Social Security, as it was envisioned, took money from current workers to pay for current retirees. Now, that worked very well 50 years ago when we might have had 40 workers paying into a system for every one retiree. But that is not true today. Instead, we are down to 3½ workers now supporting every retiree, and we are rapidly on the road to having only two workers support every retiree. So we have this phenomena of having more and more retirees and fewer and fewer workers paying into the system.

Another challenge we have in Social Security, as far as demographics is concerned, is great news for seniors; it is just not particularly good news for the Social Security System. When Social Security was first created, the average life-span of an American worker was 60 years of age. You could not even draw your retirement until 65. Many folks had their name called on the roll up yonder before they could ever get a penny of retirement. Well, now, thanks to the marvels of modern medicine and technology, the average life-span of an American worker has increased to 77.

So, again, Madam Speaker, we have more and more retirees that are living longer and longer and fewer and fewer workers supporting them. And that is putting an incredible financial pressure on the system.

Something else it is doing is it is eroding the security in Social Security. Look at the amount of money people paid into a system versus what they took out. My grandparents, who are deceased, were born roughly in 1900. They received about a 12 percent rate of return on their Social Security. That is great. My parents, who were born in the late 1920s and early 1930s respectively, they receive about a 4 percent rate of return on their Social Security. Not bad.

People in my generation, represented by those who were born in roughly 1960, we are getting about 2½ percent rate on our Social Security. That will barely cover the rate of inflation. And my children, who I spoke about earlier, they are due to receive a negative rate of return.

Madam Speaker, that is absolutely unfair. We need to do something, and we need to do something today. But something as big as reforming Social Security needs to be done on a bipartisan basis.

□ 1630

I wish we could be joined by Members on the other side of the aisle who

would come in and work with us on a bipartisan basis to try to do something about Social Security. Members cannot deny the underlying demographic challenges in this program.

Right now the Government Accountability Office, the Social Security trustees, and any agency that has looked at the problem says that the unfunded liability of Social Security is now \$10.4 trillion. Nobody in America knows how much money that is, but to try to bring it down to a level we understand, that means every man, woman and child in America, to try to solve the long-term fiscal instability of this program, would have to write a \$30,000 check out today to try to solve that problem. Surely that is not going to happen.

For those who continue to deny the problem, as so many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do, right now it is written in the current law that if we do not act, if we do nothing, if we ignore this problem, in 2042, there will be an automatic benefit cut of almost one-third.

Madam Speaker, I may not be here in 2042, but I hope and I pray that my children will be, and for generational fairness we need to do something.

What the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) has laid out is a simple plan and a very simple first step. I am surprised it is even debatable in this body. But for years and years and years the Social Security surplus has been taken by Congresses, and I will admit both Republicans and Democrats. They have taken the surplus and spent it on other areas of government. They have spent it on Medicare wheelchairs that cost five times as much as what they did at the VA. They spent it on \$2 million studies of the sexual habits of older men, and that is a study I do not even care to know what the results said. The list goes on and on and on.

That money needs to be dedicated to Social Security and nothing else. Those on the other side of the aisle said wait a second, this is very risky to create personal accounts for the Social Security surplus.

Madam Speaker, what is really risky is for Americans to leave their retirement security in the hands of Washington politicians and bureaucrats. The Social Security trust fund has been raided over 49 different times. Congress has just stepped in and spent that money on something else.

There have been over 20 tax increases in the Social Security system. Every time you are getting the same benefits but your taxes go up, your rate of return goes down. We are losing that security out of Social Security. There have been multiple benefit cuts. For example, the taxation of Social Security benefits that took place in the early 1980s. Also, very importantly, that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) pointed out, right now we have no ownership rights in our Social Security. None whatsoever. There have been several Supreme Court cases to

tell us that we do not own our Social Security.

So this is a very simple plan. We know we do have some remaining years of surplus: 10, 11, 12 years of surplus remaining. Let us take that. Let us dedicate that to Social Security and let us get it out of Washington and put it into an account with your name on it that you own and that can be inherited and passed on, something that Washington cannot waste. What a simple proposition, and I am just saddened this is even debatable at this time.

I hope anyone who is listening to this debate will let their voice be heard. We need to enact our grow accounts. We need to keep the security in Social Security for future generations.

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, I would like to engage in a brief discussion to make this a little more followable or reasonable for our listeners to understand.

Like me, I assume the gentleman has done town halls at home on this topic.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I have done at least 30.

Mr. SHADEGG. And what reaction did you get back home when people began to learn from at least 1993 forward to today, we have had an ongoing surplus of Social Security revenues over the benefits we pay out to those currently retired?

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I think it is one of the most violent reactions I have ever seen at a town hall meeting, particularly when seniors realize they have worked and paid into this system, and for decades, Congress has taken that money and spent it on big government. They wanted it stopped today.

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, I am guessing the gentleman's experience is like mine, Americans have a simple image in their mind that if these are payroll taxes taken to fund Social Security, we ought to be using them to fund Social Security.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, it is a very simple idea and they have been told for years that money is in the trust fund. In a technical legalistic sense maybe it is in the trust fund, but in any practical sense it is not. That money has been taken away and an IOU left in its place. That is like a person writing an IOU to themselves. The only way that IOU can be redeemed is by raising taxes on the American people.

People who are entering the job force today, if we do not do something to try to make up that IOU, their payroll taxes are going to have to be increased 43 percent and what is that going to do to younger families and job creation in America.

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, the gentleman mentioned that we are quickly approaching the point where Social Security no longer has the word "security" in it. I have a female constituent in Arizona, born in Hungary, moved to the United States, lived here all her life, paid into Social Security.

She comes to my town halls, and she used to come to my coffee cup meetings on Saturday mornings. Years ago she stood up and made it very clear that, based on a point the gentleman made a few moments ago, it is not accurately described as Social Security, it is more accurately described as social insecurity. Because as the gentleman pointed out, the United States Supreme Court has ruled in a series of decisions that if the Congress were to decide tomorrow to not fund Social Security, to not pay the benefits but to use that money for some other purpose, it could do so. If a taxpayer were to sue and say no, wait a minute, that is my money that I paid into the Social Security system so it would be used for my retirement, that taxpayer would simply lose that lawsuit.

So her description of it is because it is in the hands of the politicians and they can take it away at any time, she describes it as social insecurity.

It is important for our listeners to understand these GROW accounts would change that and change that forever. We would be taking the surplus and putting it aside in the name of the taxpayer, and from that instant forward it would be their money and they could keep it. That is a dramatic change in the system.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, it could not be more simple and I cannot believe that at least in my district in Texas that 99 percent of my constituents would not want to embrace that idea. Such a simple idea that number one, Social Security ought to be used for Social Security, pure and simple.

Second of all, you know own it. Washington cannot take it away. Social Security is used for Social Security, and you own it and Washington cannot take it away. That is what the GROW account is all about. There is nothing more to it. It is that simple, yet it is that important.

Again, I think we need to emphasize for those soon-to-be retired, we will be running surpluses. These people will be okay, but it is future generations. That is the challenge that we face now. Too many people in this town care about the next election and not the next generation. We could ignore this problem if we wanted to for 5, 10, 12 years, but how do you look yourself in the mirror and know that you have set the Nation on a course to cut your children and grandchildren's Social Security by a full third or to raise their taxes by 43 percent.

That is why it is so important that we start the GROW accounts, dedicate Social Security to Social Security, and let taxpayers own it, not Washington.

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, we have been joined by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) and I am thrilled to have her join in the discussion about what we do about Social Security, reforming Social Security, and about the new idea of the GROW accounts, of taking just the surplus

that Congress has been stealing and spending on general government, take that Social Security surplus and dedicate it to accounts in the names of individuals so it is their money and so every dime of Social Security taxes goes to Social Security.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and all those who have developed the legislation to save Social Security which we call GROW.

I am going to repeat some of the things that both Members have said because I think it is important to repeat them. There are many times when we have to say the same things over and over in order to get the message across.

We have heard a lot about Social Security reform. I just came here this year. This is my first term. I was told it was going to be an exciting term, and a lot of things would be done, and I cannot think about something more exciting than save Social Security.

There are a lot of strong opinions about doing this, but we get some of our best ideas not from Washington but from places like the Fifth District of North Carolina that I represent. That is why I commute to Washington to vote but return home every chance I get.

Recently, as I often do, I stopped by a restaurant in my district to have breakfast. While I was there, I engaged the people there in a discussion about Social Security reform. I shared with them some of the same things you have been talking about, and many people do not understand the fundamental facts about Social Security.

We have got to make sure that our current retirees and those near retirement have the peace of mind of knowing they are going to get their full Social Security benefits for their entire retirement. The government has promised them that, and that is an obligation we have. But we also have to make sure that the benefits are there for our children and grandchildren. The folks in Bojangles that I talked with understand this and certainly agree with us, but we know right now that Social Security is financially broken.

I think that the President has done a good job of explaining that to the people, but again over and over we have to say it. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) said, back in 1950, we had 16 workers working for every person drawing from Social Security, for every beneficiary. Today there are just over 3 workers paying for each person receiving benefits. Within two decades only 2 people will be supporting each retiree.

I love his phrase about the law of demographics. He is absolutely right. We can repeal a lot of laws here and pass a lot of laws, but we simply cannot repeal the law of demographics, and we are facing that in this country. We have to deal with it. We have to understand that is a reality that has to be dealt with.

The life expectancy is much longer today than it was when Social Security

was created. As he said back in 1929, people were only expected to live 57 years. In 1937 when Social Security was adopted, people were expected to live to only 60. Well, Social Security was set up to be drawn out at age 65. The people who set up Social Security never expected many people to draw from Social Security. But today, most people live to be 80, and it is not too much in the distant future that most of us are going to be living to 100.

The fact of the matter is that Social Security will begin running out of money in just 13 years and be completely broke in a matter of decades. For the millions of Americans who depend on Social Security, it is simply unacceptable. If we do not reform Social Security, taxes will have to be doubled or tripled in order for the system to keep its promises to future retirees.

In less than 40 years if we do not make changes, the government will have to take at least 30 to 40 percent of every worker's wages to pay for Social Security benefits. Compare that to 1940 when workers paid only 1 percent of their salary into the system, and that was basically the promise that was made when Social Security was adopted.

President Bush has called on Congress to help fix the Social Security system, and I agree with him that we have to take action. I think that the GROW accounts are a great step in the right direction. We have to protect Social Security benefits for our current retirees and near retirees while giving younger workers more ownership and control over their Social Security taxes.

I like the idea of giving workers control and putting their money into their personal accounts. This gives them control over their money and the government less opportunity to misuse it. I am confident that once people focus on the facts and study this issue, they will realize that Social Security reform is essential.

Many people have been misled about the need for reform. However, once they have the facts, and I am convinced of this, they agree that something has to be done to protect the retirements of our future generations. We have a responsibility to save Social Security so our children and grandchildren can receive the benefits that we have enjoyed.

□ 1645

Several different programs have been recommended to deal with the Social Security problem, but I am convinced that the plan that has come together to be called the GROW accounts is the best plan that we have right now to move us in the right direction. As other people have said, we have an obligation not only to the people who are currently drawing Social Security but those who are coming after us to make sure that their money is where they can draw it out and look to their retirement.

One of the things I ask people about all the time, too, is can anybody live on the average benefit that Social Security gives them. It is my understanding it is \$921. That is the average benefit. So far in all the town hall meetings that I have had and all the discussions I have had, nobody that I know of says they can live off \$921 a month.

I think that this discussion we have had on Social Security is performing a couple of good services for us. One, it is focusing on the problems with Social Security; but it is also raising the awareness of the American public that you cannot just depend on Social Security for your retirement. You have got to be looking to other ways to have the kinds of funds that you need to live comfortably in your retirement, and I think that that is the other benefit that this discussion on Social Security has brought about.

I again want to commend the gentleman and his colleagues for what they have done in bringing to us the GROW accounts, and I want to tell you that you have my support on this. This may not be where we end up on salvaging Social Security, but it is certainly a step in the right direction. As they say, a journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. We are taking the first steps. I want to thank you for doing that and pledge my support to you in educating the American public about this and hope that even more good ideas will come as a result of the discussions.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentlewoman will remain for a moment, I would like to just ask her, I presume you have done Social Security town halls back home.

Ms. FOXX. We have.

Mr. SHADEGG. If they went like mine, you got a lot of feedback and a lot of confusion about how the Social Security system works.

Ms. FOXX. We did.

Mr. SHADEGG. I suppose, like a lot of us, people are confused about, well, what is the right overall solution and they are not quite sure exactly which reform measure is the right one to do. Is that right?

Ms. FOXX. That is right. But they do know, as you have pointed out before, that they and others have paid money into the government and they were expecting to get that money back with some reasonable rate of return, some interest paid back on it. That is the deal we made with them.

Mr. SHADEGG. And when they discover, as our colleague from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) explained, that we are actually taking that short-term surplus that we have, the excess of revenues we are getting in this year over the benefits we are paying out this year and we are spending it on other things, as he pointed out, we are spending it on phenomenally expensive wheelchairs or we are spending it on Forest Service pickup trucks or we are spending it on welfare benefits or we are spending it on

whatever other program is out there and not spending their Social Security taxes to set aside for Social Security, not on Social Security benefits and not on paying future benefits, what kind of reaction did you get from your constituents?

Ms. FOXX. They are very upset by that. And the question is, why have you been spending the money? I am in the fortunate position, I have not been in Congress before, so I can say, I did not do that, although the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct, it has been done by both Democrats and Republicans, so we have to fix this situation.

Mr. SHADEGG. I think it is a fair question for us to ask as Members of Congress today, and I think the gentleman from Texas was very fair on that point, both Republican Congresses and Democrat Congresses have used the Social Security surplus for non-Social Security purposes. I guess the question, though, that I want to ask you and a question that I have thought about is, could I go home to my constituents and justify to them that it is appropriate for me to take their Social Security taxes and spend them on some other purpose? I think the answer for me is no. Have you given that question some thought?

Ms. FOXX. I have. I agree with them. And when my constituents say that to me, again through this education process, they have learned the problems that have been created by Social Security and, again, they have understood these laws of demographics that we have explained. They want us to stop this. It is a pretty simple thing. Most of the people in my district are just down-to-earth folks with a lot of common sense. There is some sort of rule, what is that law, when you are in a hole, the first law is to stop digging. They just say to me, just quit doing it.

Mr. SHADEGG. Just quit digging. Quit stealing that Social Security surplus and spending it on other things.

Ms. FOXX. That is right. So the proposal you have made I think is again a step in the right direction. Down the road we may find that we have to do other things, but the most important thing is to get people to get control of their retirement. As I said, I think that this issue has brought up the point that they cannot just depend on the Federal Government to look after them. I think we have performed a cruel hoax actually on the people of this country by letting them think that their Social Security was going to take care of them in the manner to which they have become accustomed. It is only one part of it, but it should be a secure part of their retirement. As the gentleman from Texas has said, the security part has gone away.

Mr. SHADEGG. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her contribution to this discussion and invite her to stay and discuss it further.

I do want to build on a couple of points she made. First of all, I want to

make it clear that this is not my idea. I am one of the people advancing it. Here in the House, it will be introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I think his name will be the second on the bill. The first name on the bill will be that of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY), who is the chairman of the subcommittee on Ways and Means that deals with Social Security, so it will be the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY) and then the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and then the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON). Those will be the original cosponsors along with myself here on the House side.

But I think there are literally dozens, maybe even hundreds, I would hope, of Members here on the House side who will be cosponsors of the bill when it is introduced. I have to give credit where credit is due. The original idea, as I mentioned earlier, was brought to the Congress by my former colleague here in the House, now a member of the United States Senate, JIM DEMINT, and there are at least 11 Senators who have already signed on as a coalition to try to build support for this idea on the Senate side as well. I think it is important that we build momentum for that.

When we have these discussions, it is useful for the listening audience to know that they can go other places to learn more. The policy committee which I chair has a Web site with substantial information about this idea of taking the Social Security surplus and dedicating it to individual accounts for individual taxpayers and making it their money forever; but I am certain that at your personal Web site and at my personal Web site, they can gather other information and learn about it.

The thing that occurred to me in that question about how do you oppose this, and our colleague from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) said, Gosh, I don't even understand why this is even debatable, I would hope that Members listening to this debate, but, hopefully, Americans listening to our discussion tonight, might say to themselves, I would like to learn a little bit more about GROW accounts, I would like to at least ask my Member of Congress whether she or he thinks it is appropriate to take my payroll taxes that I pay in for Social Security and spend those on something other than Social Security, whether it is wheelchairs or jet airplanes; and if they say, no, it is not really appropriate to take the payroll taxes that I pay in for Social Security, FICA, that I get on my little pay stub and use those for something else, to ask their Member of Congress whether she or he will vote to dedicate the Social Security surplus, we have 10 more years of surplus that we know of without any reform at all, we have 10 more years of surplus, do you favor allowing the Congress to continue to steal that money and spend it on other things, agricul-

tural programs, you name it, or will your Member of Congress agree to vote to dedicate the payroll taxes that we raise for Social Security solely to Social Security?

I certainly hope that Americans across the country when they see their Member of Congress this coming weekend or sometime over the August break, I hope they will confront them and ask them that question because I think it is the question we have to answer. Maybe we cannot solve the whole Social Security problem in a single blow. Maybe we cannot do it all at once; but the one thing we can do, and I like the way you say it, we can stop digging the hole deeper by taking the Social Security surplus and spending it on something other than Social Security.

Ms. FOXX. I think that is a very, very fair question. I think you are absolutely right. The challenge is to get a majority of the Members of Congress, in the House and the Senate, to commit to doing this. It is the only fair thing to do. Again, it is such a commonsense issue. The people of this country understand that is their money, they have worked hard for it, they and their employer are putting that money aside and they expect to be able to get that money back, again with some reasonable amount of interest when it comes time for them to retire.

People can find more information on the Internet these days than I ever even wanted to know, but they can get in touch with their Member of Congress, they can find out where he or she stands on the GROW accounts and where he or she stands on the issue of saving Social Security. I would encourage them to do so.

Mr. SHADEGG. I actually am going to spend a little time now trying, hopefully, to bring anybody who maybe joined this discussion late up to speed on this particular idea, and I want to do it first graphically.

In this discussion tonight, we have talked about what is happening with Social Security and the whole notion of Social Security reform; but we have tried to focus on a simple idea that has come forward recently to deal with the several problems that are confronting the Social Security program.

The biggest problem, of course, is that demographics make it unsustainable over time. We have too few people working and paying in benefits for the number of retirees. We have already heard about that tonight. In the long run, we are going to run out of money; but in the short run, we have a surplus and there is an idea that I think will protect America's taxpayers and strengthen our Social Security system that has just surfaced here in Washington within the last 3 or 4 weeks that I think is a brilliantly simple idea, and I want to try to explain it.

It is embodied in a bill called the GROW Act; Growing Real Ownership

for Workers Account is the name of the act. It is being introduced here on the House side by several Members of the Ways and Means Committee, led by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY) and on the Senate side by Senator JIM DEMINT and 11 of his colleagues.

I just want to explain very simply the concept of the bill. First of all, I have got a blank piece of paper here. I want to just graphically show what is going on with Social Security. The first thing I want to do is put a line on the chart which shows the benefits that we are currently paying out. Those benefits are fairly level. That line just runs across the chart from left to right. You can see benefits just move across that line. That is the amount of money we have to pay out each year to retired Americans.

I want to start with today, and I want to show revenues. To show revenues, I want to show kind of the graphic notion of this temporary surplus. Right now, we are bringing in more money than we are spending in benefits. So the surplus stands out here. But that surplus begins to go down just like that. All of this is money that we are collecting in excess of what we are spending in benefits. So this is the benefit line, I will label it "benefit," and this is the revenue line. You can see because the revenue line is above the benefit, we have more money coming in in Social Security taxes today than we are paying out in benefits.

What that says is that today's retirees and near retirees are secure. We are not going to do anything to touch their benefits. If you are 55 years of age or older in America, you are safe. But let us put a date on this. This is 2005. This year is 2017. What happens is that in 2017 that surplus disappears, and we begin to have a deficit. That will be a line that goes down like this. We have to deal with our ability to pay our benefits during these years by using the trust fund.

But the question is, what do we do with this surplus? I am going to label it "S" for the surplus. That is the money we have that comes in in payroll taxes that my constituents have deducted from their paychecks and it says FICA on it and that is the amount of money that is not needed to pay benefits. That is extra money.

What we have been talking about here tonight is that extra money every year since 1983 with only two exceptions has been spent by Congress on something other than Social Security. They may be good things. They may be welfare benefits for those in need. They may be forest fire fighting. It may be spent for missiles or tanks for our war in Iraq, but it is being spent on something other than Social Security. Fundamentally, the American people deserve to have their payroll taxes that are collected to fund Social Security spent on Social Security.



□ 1700

What the GROW Act does, this bill that is being proposed here on the House side and there on the Senate side to deal with at least a part of the Social Security problem, is to say we need to stop spending this surplus, and I am going to label the surplus as showing this block of money right here, that block of money, that we need to stop the practice of spending that Social Security surplus on things other than Social Security.

It is pretty simple when we look at it graphically. Social Security money should be spent to pay for Social Security benefits, and if there is a surplus, we should set it aside to pay the Social Security benefits of those who will retire in years to come.

Let me go through just a simple kind of a Q&A session about what this bill does because it might help people, and then I would urge people to get on the Web site of the Policy Committee or to get on the Web site of the Republican conference here in Washington and look at what this bill does and how it works. But before I do that, let me go through a Q&A, just kind of a basic so people can understand what we are talking about.

First question: What will the GROW Act do? Simply put, it stops the government from spending the Social Security surplus, a person's payroll taxes paid to fund Social Security when they retire, on anything other than Social Security. Again, in almost every year since 1983, Congress has spent this surplus of payroll taxes over payroll benefits on something other than Social Security.

How would we stop doing that, how will Congress stop spending that? The answer is we are going to put it into individual accounts. We will take this surplus. We will divide it by the number of Americans who are paying payroll taxes, and we will put it aside in an account with their name on it. From that instant forward, it is their money. It will be in an individual lock box, and that will change the way the program works rather dramatically. For one thing, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) pointed out a few moments ago, people's current Social Security benefits are not guaranteed. If the government changes its mind, if Congress were to change its mind and stop paying those benefits or even reduce, people lose to that degree. Once we start taking this money and put it into a GROW account with their name on it, in my case, my daughter is young enough to enroll in this program. It would only apply to Americans under age 55. She can enroll and her name would be on an account. It would say "Courtney Shadegg," and a portion of the payroll taxes that she is paying in would go into that account in her name. If she were to pass away today, God forbid, she would get nothing and she would have nothing as an asset in her estate to pass on. But the moment we establish these GROW ac-

counts, she would have the money in that account to give to her children if she wanted to.

People say to their themselves how much money in this surplus would that amount? If I am just an average worker in America and you take, Congressman, that surplus and you allocate it in my name, over the 10 years that we have left during which there is clearly a surplus, without any other reform, how much money would it amount to? Well, in typical Washington terms, they give us the gross number, and it is \$790 billion. But what does that mean for me, individual? On average it means that every single working American paying Social Security taxes right now would have roughly \$5,000 in this account in 2017, just 10 years from now. If we were to start the accounts this year, in roughly 10 years, they would have \$5,000 in an account in their name that they could pass on.

Now, what happens to that money if one passes away? The answer is it is their asset. It is just like the car they own today or the savings account they own today or the bank account or the money in their checking account. If they pass away, that money goes, all of it, 100 percent of it, to their spouse or, if they are unmarried or divorced, it goes to their other heirs. It can go to their children or their grandchildren or to their brother or sister or whoever they want to leave it to just like any other asset that they own.

How does it affect current retirees? It does not affect current retirees. Current retirees are secure because we do not need this money to pay their benefits. This is, after all, the surplus after the benefits have been paid.

What is the budget impact of establishing these GROW accounts? I would call it truth in budgeting. What it says is that once we establish a GROW account and stop taking the Security Social surplus and spending that money to fund other operations of the government, we will be able to see the real deficit each year, and that way we will be able to know honestly and straightforwardly how much money we have.

What is the upside of these accounts? Well, there are so many upsides, it is hard to explain. Number one, it is a person's asset. They can keep it. Number two, initially they get to invest it in a treasury fund. For the first 3 years they may buy a treasury bill, and that is all they will be able to do is buy a treasury bill with it. But that treasury bill will be absolutely as secure as the Social Security funds are today, and indeed I will argue it will be more secure because it is theirs forever and the government cannot take it away. But 3 years from now the legislation provides that a board, an independent board, will be able to open up these GROW accounts so that they can invest them in other vehicles. They can invest them in an investment vehicle or an investment opportunity that would make a slightly better rate of return.

They will not be able to invest them wherever they want. They will not be able to invest them in any risky scheme, and they will not be able to pick a private firm to invest them for them. But they will be able to direct how they are invested, whether they leave them in a treasury or whether they put them in one of two or three other investment options. And I want to talk about that in a moment.

But there are two other basic things I want to touch upon. First, what about the issue of solvency? Well, GROW accounts alone will not solve the solvency problem. But they actually do make the solvency of the current system better. They make it better by roughly 2 years if we enact no other reform.

Let me see if I understand this, Congressman. You are telling me that this is a portion of the solution to the Social Security problem, it will set up a GROW account, we will stop spending the surplus on things other than Social Security; so every dime of Social Security taxes collected will go into Social Security and it also helps make the program more solvent over time?

I ask who would oppose that?

Before I conclude, and I do not know quite how much time I have left, but I would like to talk about the whole notion of personal accounts versus private accounts. This is a topic that has been discussed a lot in the press, and I would dare say that many people in the public do not understand the difference between a personal account and a private account, and yet there are dramatic differences. Although they right now is that Republicans call them personal accounts or individual accounts and Democrats call them private accounts. But that is not true. There are dramatic, substantive differences.

Under this proposal the individual accounts that would be established would remain in the hands of the government. They would go to a contract manager, who would manage them for everybody and who would put them only in very, very safe investments. The three most likely investments are: a municipal bond index fund; the second one is a corporate bond index fund; and the third would be a stock index fund.

What do those terms mean? Number one, since this would be a decision made by an entity that was working for the government and it would be made for all of the money in the account, a person as an individual would not have to be particularly shrewd or in any way savvy about the markets to be able to participate because they are not going to pick the individual stock or the individual bond in which the money is invested. Rather, they will be given, like those of us in the Federal Thrift Savings Plan, a choice of probably three different investments or four different investments. They can leave it in a treasury, they can put it in a municipal bond index fund, a corporate bond index fund, or a stock

index fund. And each of those will have slightly greater return.

So people do not need investment knowledge and that is very important because some critics say that one has to be a savvy investor to be able to make this work. That is simply not true.

The other point is that, because the investment decisions are made by an entity contracting with the government, the management fees are extremely low, and because they are managing a huge amount of money, the cost of investing remains extremely low.

The last point I want to make is the restriction and the difference between a personal account and a private account is not just that the government will control the funds that are picked and the manager of those funds, but also people will not be able to invest them in risky investments. Unfortunately, both Chile and England allowed true private accounts where they picked their individual stock market in which to place the money and they picked the broker and the fees were high and the investments were risky. That is not what is being talked about here.

I urge Americans to study the issue of GROW accounts. There is, I think, in reality no downside to these accounts. They enable the Congress to stop spending Social Security on anything other than Social Security, and they let each American have an individual share of the Social Security surplus that is theirs forever and can never be taken from them.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BALDWIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the memorial service for former U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson.

Mr. POMBO (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for July 11 and 12 on account of personal business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SOLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CRENSHAW) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, July 20.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 14, 2005, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2638. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions (Multiple Chemicals) [OPP-2005-0143; FRL-7722-3] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2639. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ethyl Maltol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0153; FRL-7717-1] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2640. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—3-Hexen-1-ol, (3Z); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0028; FRL-7713-2] received May 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2641. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Two Isopropylamine Salts of Alkyl C4 and Alkyl C8-10 Ethoxyphosphate esters; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0115; FRL-7712-1] received May 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2642. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Tertraconazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2005-0078; FRL-7714-1] received May 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2643. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0142; FRL-7720-1] received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2644. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2005-0155; FRL-7720-2] received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2645. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cyprodinil; Time-Limited Tolerance [OPP-2005-0119; FRL-7718-3] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2646. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Regional Haze Regulations and Guidelines for Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) Determinations [FRL-7925-9] (RIN: 2060-AJ31) received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2647. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ocean Dumping; De-Designation of Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Sites and Designation of New Sites; Correction [FRL-7930-7] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2648. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Miscellaneous Organic Chemical Manufacturing [OAR-2003-0121; FRL-7932-2] (RIN: 2060-AN09) received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2649. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Deletion of Methyl Ethyl Ketone; Toxic Chemical Release Reporting; Community Right-to-Know [TRI-2005-0027; FRL-7532-5] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2650. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Correction to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [R09-OAR-2005-CA-0004; FRL-7932-3] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2651. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Spokane PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [Docket #: R10-OAR-2004-WA-0003; FRL-7927-2] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2652. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota [R05-OAR-2005-MN-0002; FRL-7931-2] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2653. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; State Implementation Plan Correction [SIP NO. CO-001-0072; FRL-7931-7] received June 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2654. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Determination of Attainment by the Applicable Attainment Date for the Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard within the Las Vegas Valley Nonattainment Area, Clark County, Nevada; Determination Regarding Applicability of Certain Clean Air Act Requirements [NV-FDA-129; FRL-7919-7] received May 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2655. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Alabama: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7920-6] received May 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2656. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona; Redesignation of Phoenix to Attainment for the 1-Hour Ozone Standard [AZ131-0088; FRL-7901-6] received May 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2657. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Determination of Attainment for the Ozone and Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards in Washoe County, Nevada [NV-FOA-126; FRL-7907-3] received May 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2658. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Michigan: Oxides of Nitrogen [R05-OAR-2004-MI-0002; FRL-7904-4] received May 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2659. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri [R07-OAR-2005-MO-0004; FRL-7906-7] received May 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2660. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Iowa [R07-OAR-2005-IA-0002; FRL-7906-9] received May 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2661. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Air Quality Redesignation for the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard; for some Counties in the States of Kansas and Missouri [R07-OAR-2005-MO-0002; FRL-7906-5] received May 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2662. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Toxics Release Inventory Reporting Forms Modification Rule [TRI-2004-0001; FRL-7532-6] (RIN: 2025-AA15) received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2663. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule—Nonattainment Major New Source Review Implementation Under 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard: Reconsideration [E-Docket ID No. OAR-2003-0079, FRL-7934-9] (RIN: 2060-AJ99) received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2664. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Requirements for Control Technology Determinations for Major Sources in Accordance With Clean Air Act Sections, Sections 112(g) and 112(j) [OAR-2002-0038, FRL-7935-4] (RIN: 2060-AK52) received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2665. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Enforceable Consent Agreement and Testing Consent Order for Two Formulated Composites of Fluorotelomer-based Polymer Chemicals; Export Notification [OPPT-2004-0001; FRL-7710-4] received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2666. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Enforceable Consent Agreement and Testing Consent Order for Four Formulated Composites of Fluoropolymer Chemicals; Export Notification [OPPT-2003-0071; FRL-7710-5] received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2667. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; State of Arizona; Pima County Department of Environmental Quality; State of Nevada; Nevada Division of Environmental Protection [AZ-NESHAPS-131a; FRL-7935-2] received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2668. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Idaho [Docket #ID-03-003; FRL-7936-1] received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2669. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Washington; Correcting Amendments [R10-OAR-2005-WA-0006; FRL-7936-3] received July 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2670. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Vermont: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7927-1] received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2671. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Cellulose Products Manufacturing [OAR-2003-0193; FRL-7925-8] (RIN: 2060-AL91) received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2672. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Delegation of Authority to the States of Iowa and Kansas for New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP); and Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) Standards [FRL-7927-4] received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2673. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designation Facilities and Pollutants; Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Negative Declaration; Correction [R06-OAR-2005-NM-0003; FRL-7928-4] received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2674. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Ohio; Revised Oxides of Nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) Regulation and Revised NO<sub>x</sub> Trading Rule [R05-OAR-2004-OH-0003; FRL-7923-2] received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2675. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Washington; Spokane Carbon Monoxide Nonattainment Area; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes [Docket ID No. R10-OAR-2005-WA-0001; FRL-7929-7] received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2676. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Control VOC Emissions From Aerospace, Mobile Equipment, and Wood Furniture Surface Coating Applications for Allegheny County [R03-OAR-2005-PA-0014; FRL-7927-5] received June 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2677. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; VOC Emission Standards in the Hampton Roads VOC Emissions Control Area [R03-OAR-2005-VA-0008; FRL-7925-6] received June 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2678. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Implementation of the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard—Phase 1: Reconsideration [OAR 2003-0079, FRL-7918-6] received May 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2679. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; VOC Regulations [R01-OAR-2004-ME-0005; A-1-FRL-7913-3] received May 25, 2005, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2680. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan, Maricopa County [AZ-140-128; FRL-7912-3] received May 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2681. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Smaller-Scale Electric Generating Resources [R01-OAR-2005-ME-0002; A-1-FRL-7915-1] received May 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2682. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Celebrate the Fourth/Salem Fireworks—Salem, Massachusetts [CGD01-05-052] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2683. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Rochester Harbor Boat Parade, Rochester, NY [CGD09-05-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2684. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Boston Fourth of July Fireworks—Charles River, Boston, MA [CGD1-05-036] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2685. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Aging Airplane Safety; Correcting Amendment [Docket No. FAA-1999-5401; Amendment Nos. 121-310 and 129-41] (RIN: 2120-AE42) received May 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2686. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ocean Disposal; Designation of Dredged Material Disposal Sites in Central and Western Long Island Sound, Connecticut. [FRL-7919-9] received May 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2687. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Award of Grants and Cooperative Agreements for the Special Projects and Programs Authorized by the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act—received June 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 624.

A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants (Rept. 109-166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1359. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects; with an amendment (Rept. 109-167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on Internal Relations. H.R. 2601. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3262. A bill to modify the civil money penalties incurred for unlawful employment of aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMP (for himself, Mr. HALL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. GILCREST):

H.R. 3263. A bill to reduce the growth of energy use in the United States, to limit the impact of growing energy use on the economy, environment, and national security of the United States through reductions in energy demand, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3264. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program for the rehabilitation, preservation, or improvement of railroad track; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 3265. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide an interest-free deferment of student loan repayment for Federal student loan borrowers during active military service; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3266. A bill to condition the receipt of Federal housing funds by a State or political subdivision of a State, or any agency or office thereof, on the preparation of an economic housing impact analysis regarding any new rule proposed by the State, political subdivision, agency, or office that has a significant adverse economic impact on housing construction costs or housing affordability of \$50,000,000 or more, and for other other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLIVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY,

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CARSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 3267. A bill to provide benefits to domestic partners of Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PITTS, Ms. HART, Ms. FOX, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain from the conversion of property by reason of eminent domain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 3269. A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act to provide for the applicability of that Act to the Bank for International Settlements; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 3270. A bill to improve the security of public transportation and rail systems in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 3271. A bill to improve the enforcement of international trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 3272. A bill to provide for a demonstration project under which a basic housing allowance will be afforded to Federal law enforcement officers serving in high-cost areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 3273. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for flexible fuel vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for qualified clean-fuel vehicle refueling property and to amend the Clean Air Act to make ethanol fuels more available to motorists; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the minimum end-strength level for active duty personnel for the United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FORD, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HALL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCKEON, Miss McMORRIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment the Constitu-

tion of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HALL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FARR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. HERSETH, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of Rosa Louise Parks' refusal to give up her seat on the bus and the subsequent desegregation of American society; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 361. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Veterans Administration on July 21, 1930; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
H.R. 13: Mr. SIMPSON.  
H.R. 23: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 223: Mr. TERRY.  
H.R. 314: Mr. SIMPSON.  
H.R. 408: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.  
H.R. 475: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 550: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 551: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 586: Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 595: Mr. FATTAH.  
H.R. 633: Mr. BOUCHER.  
H.R. 818: Mrs. MALONEY.  
H.R. 896: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 917: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.  
H.R. 1039: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. HERGER.  
H.R. 1081: Mr. VISCOSKY.  
H.R. 1188: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALBOMAVEGA, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1202: Mr. KIND and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1214: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1245: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1246: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FORD, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 1287: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1288: Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1298: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1366: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1480: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1502: Mr. WEINER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1554: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1600: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1667: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2103: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 2121: Ms. HART and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 2207: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2338: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 2355: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 2365: Mr. OWENS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 2429: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2533: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2658: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 2716: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2747: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2794: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2865: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2868: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 2942: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2952: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. FARR, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 2989: Mrs. CUBIN and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3009: Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3137: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3147: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 3200: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.J. Res. 55: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. KLINE.

H. Con. Res. 174: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 220: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Res. 276: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. DENT.

H. Res. 313: Mr. EVANS and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.

H. Res. 360: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. CASE.